The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME 35 • APRIL 1949 • NUMBER 2

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RHETORIC AND PUBLIC ADDRESS FOR THE YEAR 1948

Frederick W. Haberman, *Editor*

in collaboration with Carroll C. Arnold, *Cornell University;* J. Jeffery Auer, *Oberlin College;* Waldo W. Braden, *Louisiana State University;* Donald C. Bryant, *Washington University;* Dallas C. Dickey, *University of Florida;* Otto A. Dieter, *University of Illinois;* Wayne C. Eubank, *University of Florida;* Alfred Galpin, *University of Wisconsin;* Charles F. Hunter, *Northwestern University;* Franklin H. Knower, *Ohio State University;* Harry L. Levy, *Hunter College;* Norman W. Mattis, *University of North Carolina;* Aurora M. Quiros, *University of California at Berkeley;* Renato Rosaldo, *University of Wisconsin.*

This bibliography includes the more important publications on rhetoric and public address appearing in the year 1948. We have listed and, in many instances, reviewed publications in those major languages having a strong tradition of rhetoric and in those major fields of study producing work of interest to scholars in rhetoric and public address. Publications in journals which appeared in 1947 are listed if they escaped notice in the bibliography for that year (QJS 34 (1948) 277-99). Books published before 1948 are included if a significant review has appeared in 1948. In all cases where no date is specified in the entry, the year 1948 may be assumed.

INDEX

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANCIENT PUBLIC ADDRESS
1. History, Culture
2. Theory
3. Practitioners

MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE PUBLIC ADDRESS
1. History, Culture
2. Theory
3. Practitioners

MODERN PUBLIC ADDRESS
1. History, Culture
2. Theory
3. Platform Address
   a. *Practitioners*
4. Pulpit Address
   a. *General: History, Surveys*
   b. *Practitioners*
5. Radio Address
   a. *General: History, Effects, Techniques*
   b. *Experimental Studies*
6. Debate
   a. *General: History, Types, Techniques*
7. Discussion
   a. *General: History, Types, Techniques*
   b. *Experimental Studies*

Abbreviations

A	América (Habana)
AAA	The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science
AHR	The American Historical Review
AI	Annals of Iowa
AJP	American Journal of Philology
AJS	American Journal of Sociology
AL	American Literature
ALQ	The Abraham Lincoln Quarterly
AM	The Americas
AmN&Q	American Notes and Queries
AP	American Psychologist
APSR	The American Political Science Review
AQ	Atlantic Quarterly
AR	Antioch Review
AS	American Scholar
ASR	American Sociological Review
At	Atenea (Concepción, Chile)
AtM	The Atlantic Monthly
BA	Books Abroad
BBM	Boletín Bibliográfico Mexicano (Mexico City)
BDAPC	Bulletin of the Debating Association of Pennsylvania Colleges
BH	Bulletin Hispanique (Bordeaux)
BJP	British Journal of Psychology (London)
BNAP	Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals
CaW	Catholic World
CB	The Classical Bulletin
CER	Catholic Educational Review
CH	Current History
CHR	Catholic Historical Review
CJ	The Classical Journal
CM	Classica et Mediaevalia
CO	Chronicles of Oklahoma
CoR	Contemporary Review
CP	Classical Philology
CQ	Classical Quarterly
CR	The Classical Review
CW	Classical Weekly
D	Dialectica
DM	Debater's Magazine
E	Escorial (Madrid)
ELH	Journal of English Literary History
EPM	Educational and Psychological Measurement
ERB	Educational Research Bulletin
F	Fortnightly
FFR	Film Forum Review
FL	Le Figaro Litteraire (Paris)
GHQ	Georgia Historical Quarterly
GPM	Genetic Psychology Monographs
H	Hispania
HAHR	Hispanic American Historical Review
HJ	Hibbert Journal
HLQ	Huntington Library Quarterly
HMPEC	Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church
HR	Human Relations (London)
IJOAR	International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research
It	L'Italia che scrive (Rome)
JAAC	The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism
JAP	Journal of Applied Psychology
JASP	Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology
JEE	Journal of Experimental Education
JEGP	Journal of English and Germanic Philology
JEP	Journal of Educational Psychology
JExP	Journal of Experimental Psychology
JGP	Journal of General Psychology
JHI	Journal of the History of Ideas
JMH	The Journal of Mississippi History
JNH	Journal of Negro History
JP	The Journal of Politics
JPer	Journal of Personality
JPsy	Journal of Psychology
JSH	The Journal of Southern History
JSI	Journal of Social Issues
JSP	Journal of Social Psychology
KHQ	The Kansas Historical Quarterly
MA	Mid-America
MH	Michigan History
MnH	Minnesota History
ML	Modern Languages
MLN	Modern Language Notes
MLQ	Modern Language Quarterly
MP	Modern Philology
MTQ	Mark Twain Quarterly
MVHR	The Mississippi Valley Historical Review
N	The Nation
NA	Nuova Antologia (Rome)
NCHR	The North Carolina Historical Review
NEQ	New England Quarterly
NH	Nebraska History
NR	The New Republic
NRFH	Nueva Revista de Filolgía Hispánica (Mexico City)
NYH	New York History

NYTB	New York Times Book Review
OHQ	Oregon Historical Quarterly
OSAHQ	The Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly
P	Philologus
PA	Parliamentary Affairs (London)
PH	Pennsylvania History
Ph	The Phoenix (Toronto)
PI	Printers Ink
PJ	Personnel Journal
PMHB	The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography
PMLA	Publications of the Modern Language Association of America
PNQ	Pacific Northwest Quarterly
POQ	Public Opinion Quarterly
PQ	Philological Quarterly
PR	Psychological Review
PS	Pedagogical Seminary and Journal of Genetic Psychology
QC	Quaderni della 'Critica' (Bari, Italy)
QJS	The Quarterly Journal of Speech
QR	Quarterly Review
RBC	Revista Bimestre Cubana (Habana)
RES	Review of English Studies
RHA	Revista de Historia de América (Tacubaya, Mexico)
RI	Revista Iberoamericana (Mexico City)
RIn	Revista de las Indias (Bogatá, Colombia)
RKHS	The Register of the Kentucky Historical Society
RLR	Revue des Langues Romanes
RNC	Revista Nacional de Cultura (Caracas, Venezuela)
RP	Revue de Philologie
RPL	Revue Philosophique de Louvain (Louvain, France)
RS	Rural Sociology
S	Speculum
SAQ	South Atlantic Quarterly
SE	Social Education
SHQ	Southwestern Historical Quarterly
SM	Speech Monographs
SR	Sewanee Review
SRL	Saturday Review of Literature
S&S	School and Society
SSJ	Southern Speech Journal
TAPA	Transactions of the American Philological Association
TCR	Teachers College Record
TLS	Times Literary Supplement (London)
UH	Universidad de la Habana (Habana)
VC	Vigiliae Christianae
WMH	Wisconsin Magazine of History
WMQ	The William and Mary Quarterly
WS	Western Speech

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A bibliography of rhetoric and public address for the year 1947. Ed. by Frederick W. Haberman. QJS 34 (1948) .277-99.

Dow, Clyde W. Abstracts of theses in the field of speech and drama—III. SM 15 (1948) .188-249.

In the periodicals. Ed. by Giraud Chester. QJS 34 (1948) .110-6; 260-70; 399-410; 533-43.

Knower, Franklin H. Graduate theses—an index of graduate work in speech and drama—XV. SM 15 (1948) .250-63.

ANCIENT PUBLIC ADDRESS

1. History, Culture

Combellack, Frederick M. Speakers and scepters in Homer. CJ 43 (1948) .209-17.

Freeman, Kathleen. The murder of Herodes and other trials from the Athenian law-courts. London. Macdonald. 1946.

Rev. by H. Lamar Crosby in CW 41 (1948) .230-3.

Illuminati, L. L'eloquenza romana prima di Cicerone. Parte seconda: da Catone ad Ortensio Ortalo. Messina. Ferrari.

Laurand, L., et d'Héronville, P. Manuel des études grecques et latines, par L. Laurand. 4e édition revue et corrigée par P. d'Héronville. 2 vols. Paris. Picard. 1946-7.

Appendice 2 is entitled, 'L'art oratoire des anciens.'

Marrou, H. I. Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité. Paris. du Seuil.

Rayment, Charles S. The ethics of the Roman bar. CJ 44 (1948) .207-9.

Quintilian's advice to defense lawyers.

———. The suit for ingratitude. CJ 43 (1948).429-31.

Roman law as seen in the *controversiae*.

Sollmann, Mary A. Electioneering—then and now. CJ 44 (1948).189-94.

A lively account of election customs in the republican era of Rome with frequent reference to Cicero and his brother.

2. Theory

Jennrich, Walter A. Classical rhetoric in the New Testament. CJ 44 (1948). 30-2.

3. Practitioners

ARISTOTLE. Alfonsi, Luigi. Traces du jeune Aristote dans la *Cohortatio ad gentiles* faussement attribuée à Justin. VC 2 (1948).65-88.

Jaeger, Werner. Aristotle: fundamentals of the history of his development. Translated with the author's corrections and additions by Richard Robinson. Oxford. Clarendon Press.

Rev. in TLS (February 28).127.

Thielscher, Paul. Die relative chronologie der erhaltenen schriften des Aristoteles nach den bestimmten selbstzitaten. P 97 (1948).229-65.

CICERO. Brutus. Introduzione e commentario di G. Masera. Torino. S.E.I. 1947.

Bruwaene, Martin van den. Études sur Cicéron. Brussels. L'Édition Universelle. 1946.

Rev. by Solomon Katz in CP 43 (1948).66-7; by W. S. Watt in CR 62 (1948).90-1; by R. S. Rogers in CW 42 (1948).45-6.

Catone il vecchio. Collezione Romana. Milano. Garzanti. 1947.

Cowell, F. R. Cicero and the Roman republic. New York. Chanticleer.

Rev. by H. J. Haskell in SRL 31 (December 18).11-2.

This work is actually a history of the Roman Republic. Cicero and Caesar serve as personifications of the opposing forces: republicanism and autocracy. The book is more valuable as a study of Cicero's Rome than as a study of Cicero.

Mr. Cowell restricts his examination of such Roman institutions as the senate and the popular assemblies to an evaluation of their organizational features. The dissemination of ideas through private letters receives considerable attention, the social impact of literature is slighted, and the role of public address in Cicero's state is virtually ignored. (C.C.A.)

Cremaschi, C. Cicerone. Brescia. La Scuola. 1947.

Rev. by Jean G. Préaux in Latomus 7(1948). 107-8.

De signis: discourse sur les statues. Traduction française de P.C.B. Guéroult, revue, corrigée et accompagnée de notices et de notes par G. Lamothe. Collection Les classiques pour tous. Paris. Hatier. 1947.

Frisch, Hartvig. The first Catilinarian conspiracy. CM 9 (1948).10-36.

———. Cicero's fight for the republic: the historical background of Cicero's *Philippics*. Copenhagen. Gyldendal. 1946.

Rev. by A. F. Giles in CR 62 (1948).31-3; by Walter Allen, Jr., in AJP 69 (1948).224-6; by C. H. Oldfather in CP 43 (1948).211-2.

Grant, W. Leonard. Cicero and the *Tractatus coislinianus*. AJP 69 (1948). 80-6.

Illuminati. See Ancient Public Address —History, Culture.

MacKendrick, Paul. Cicero's ideal orator—truth and propaganda. CJ 43 (1948).339-47.

Although the author shows that Cicero's 'propagandistic' work, *De oratore*, contains an ideal for the education of the expert which is important for our time, he develops, also, the thesis that ancient rhetoric, democratic in origin, became under Cicero's handling 'the device by which the privileged class justified and defended its privilege.' He presses the point diligently and expertly. Almost too diligently, perhaps. Does Cicero really interpret the *bonus* of 'vir bonus, dicendi peritus' in a political sense? When Cicero says that there is a 'vested interest in restricting knowledge of the science' is he referring to the science of *rhetoric* or to the science of *civil law*? Is rhetoric to be used to influence the multitude against *hoi polloi* or against *corruption*? To mitigate rage toward the *nobility* or toward the *virtuous*? The author picks his side on these questions and supports it with vigorous scholarship and incisive style. (F.W.H.)

Pro Q. Ligario oratio. A cura di E. Stampini. 2ª ediz. Torino. Paravia. 1947.

Rand, E. K. Cicero in the courtroom of St. Thomas Aquinas. Milwaukee. Marquette Univ. Press. 1946.
Rev. by Francis A. Sullivan in CW 41 (1948).124-6.

Riposatti, Benedetto. Studi sui *Topica* di Cicerone. Edizioni dell'Università Cattolica del S. Cuore. 22. Milano. Vita e Pensiero. 1947.

Sollmann. See Ancient Public Address—History, Culture.

Vanella, G. L'humanitas della concezione oratoria e storiografica di Cicerone. Napoli. Campa.

DEMOSTHENES. Dorjahn, Alfred P. On Demosthenes' ability to speak extemporaneously. TAPA 78 (1947).69-76.

Prima Olintiaca. Con introduzione e note di G. Mazzoni. Roma. Dante Alighieri.

HERMOGENES. De statibus. Edidit Georgius Kowalski. Wratislaviae. 1947.
A well-established Greek text of Hermogenes' *Peri staseos.*

ISOCRATES. Hudson-Williams, H. Ll. Thucydides, Isocrates, and the rhetorical method of composition. CQ 42 (1948).76-81.

Van Hook, La Rue. Some aspects of Isocrates' writings. CW 41 (1948).98-103.

LONGINUS. Tate, Allen. Longinus. Hudson Review 1 (1948).344-61.
Mr. Tate believes that the contemporary attempt to formulate a criticism 'which approaches the literary work through the analysis of style and which arrives at its larger aspects through that aperture' is at least adumbrated by Longinus.

PLATO. Lodge, R. C. Plato's theory of education. New York. Harcourt.

QUINTILIAN. Guazzoni, Foà, V. Quintiliano. Brescia. La Scuola. 1947.

Niedermann, Maximilianus, ed. Quintilian. Institutionis oratoriae libri primi capita de grammatica (1. 4-8). Bibliotheca Necomensis. Vol. 1. Neuchâtel. Éditions du Griffon. 1947.
Rev. by A. Ernout in RP 22 (1948).106-8.

Quintiliani institutiones oratoriae. Liber XII. Ed. by R. G. Austin. Oxford. Clarendon Press.
Rev. in TLS (June 5).322.
An edition with commentary of book XII of Quintilian's *Institutes.*

Rayment. See Ancient Public Address—History, Culture.

TACITUS. Opúsculos: diálogo de los oradores; vida de Julio Agrícola; de las costumbres, sitio y pueblos de la Germania. Trad. de Baltasar Alamos Barrientos. Buenos Aires. 1947.

MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE PUBLIC ADDRESS

1. History, Culture

Lejarza, Fidel de, O.F.M. Conquista espiritual del Nuevo Santander. Madrid. Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas. 1947.
Rev. by Lino G. Canedo in AM 4 (1948).533-4; by Lino Gómez Canedo in RHA 24 Diciembre 1947).418-20; by Agapito Rey in HAHR 28 (1948).82-4.
On the influence and work of missionaries in the northeastern part of Mexico, the present state of Tamaulipas.

Pellegrino, Michele. Gli apologeti greci del secondo secolo. Roma. A.V.E. 1947.
Rev. by Franco Cerutti in NA 83 (Gennaio 1948).95-9.

Ryba, Bohumil, ed. Graduation addresses by the masters (magisters) of the faculty of arts Mikulás z Litomysle and Jan z Myta at Charles Univ. in the years 1386 and 1393. Prague. Czech Academy of Arts and Sciences.

2. Theory

Allen, Don Cameron. Style and certitude. ELH 15 (1948).167-75.
This excellent article equates the prose style of various seventeenth century men with their sense of certainty. Ciceronian prose is the prose of those who, like Hooker, have a system in which they can trust. 'Senecanism' is natural to the doubters and rationalists. The 'looser

Senecan' (for which Allen proposes the term 'African,' from St. Augustine) is the style of those who, like Sir Thomas Browne and Jeremy Taylor, have had doubts but resolved them by clinging to the traditions of faith.

Although the application of the idea that there is an 'esthetic of unbelief' to individual writers and speakers gives rise to many questions, every student of style and of sermonolgy should be acquainted with this erudite, beautifully written essay. (N.W.M.)

Di Capua, Francesco. Sentenze e proverbi nella tecnica oratoria e loro influenza sull'arte del periodare. Studi sulla letteratura latina medievale. Napoli. Libreria Scientifica Editrice. 1947.

Rev. by A. Roncaglia in It 31 (1948).110-1.

Hodgson, Phyllis. *Ignorancia sacerdotum*: a fifteenth-century discourse on the Lambeth constitutions. RES 24 (1948).1-11.

Description of a middle English treatise (now in the Bodleian) written to instruct clergy and laity in the elements of Christianity. The MS., Eng. Th.c 57, may interest students of medieval sermonology.

Koller, Kathrine. The Puritan preacher's contribution to fiction. HLQ 11 (1948).321-40.

Shows that the Puritan preachers developed characterization, dialogue, autobiography, and the dramatic scene, thereby helping pave the way to the novel.

Sackton. See Medieval and Renaissance Public Address—Practitioners, *s.v.* 'Jonson.'

3. Practitioners

AUGUSTINE, SAINT. The Lord's sermon on the mount. A translation by the Very Rev. John J. Jepson. Ancient Christian Writers Series. Cork. Mercier Press.

Blumenkranz, Bernhard. Die judenpredigt Augustins. Basel. Helbing und Lichtenhan. 1946.

Rev. by Claude Jenkins in CR 62(1948).27-8.

Les plus belles homélies de St. Augustin. Ed. by Chanoine G. Hermeau. Paris. Beauchesne et ses Fils.

BACON. Anderson, F. H. The philosophy of Francis Bacon. Chicago. Univ. of Chicago Press.

CHRYSOSTOM, SAINT. Le omelie su S. Giovanni Evangelista. Parte II. Testo con note e introduzione di D. C. Tirone, O. S. B. Torino. S. E. I.

CROMWELL. Abbott, Wilbur Cortez, ed. The writings and speeches of Oliver Cromwell. Vol. 4. The protectorate, 1653-1655. Cambridge. Harvard Univ. Press. 1947.

FRANCIS, SAINT. Sticco, M. S. Francesco d'Assisi. 10ª ediz. Milano. Vita e Pensiero.

GERSON. Mourin, Louis. Six sermons français inédits de Jean Gerson: étude doctrinale et littéraire suivie de l'édition critique et de remarques linguistiques. Études de théologie et d'histoire de la spiritualité. No. 8. Paris. Vrin. 1946.

Rev. by Ray C. Petry in S 23 (1948).144-7.

HARVEY. Wilson, Harold S., and Forbes, Clarence A. Gabriel Harvey's *Ciceronianus*. Univ. of Nebraska Studies in the Humanities. No. 4. Lincoln. Univ. of Nebraska. 1945.

Rev. by J. F. Lockwood in CR 62 (1948).88-90; by Leo M. Kaiser in CJ 43 (1948).432.

IGNATIUS, SAINT. Rivadeneira, Pedro de. Vida de Ignacio de Loyola. México. Espasa-Calpe Argentina. 1946.

Rev. by Aubrey F. G. Bell in BA 22 (1948).178.

———. Vita di S. Ignazio di Loyola. Milano. Bompiani. 1947.

IZELGRINUS. Laughlin, Sister Mary Frances. The *Rethorica nova* attributed to Jacobus Izelgrinus. Ph.D. dissertation. Catholic Univ. of America Press. 1947.

Makes available the Latin text of a fifteenth century rhetorical treatise.

JONSON. Sackton, Alexander H. Rhetoric as a dramatic language in Ben Jonson. New York. Columbia.

This is the third book within two years by American scholars in which the study of rhetoric is presented as important, even essential, to the understanding of literature and of the

mind of the reading and listening public in the English Renaissance. (See Medieval and Renaissance Public Address—Practitioners, *s.v.* 'Milton' and *s.v.* 'Shakespeare,' in this bibliography for 1947. QJS 34 (1948).277-99). Sackton's thesis is that Ben Jonson made very effective use of certain of the staple topics of Renaissance rhetoric to create dramatic irony in his comedies and to heighten characterization. Furthermore, Sackton argues, these devices were especially effective because audiences were generally familiar with rhetorical teachings and easily recognized the self-conscious use of them by a playwright. The devices Jonson uses are those which characterize pomposity, ostentation, deceit, and knavery. It seems hardly necessary, however, for a man who has written as sensible a chapter as Sackton's on the Tradition of Rhetoric to mistake the abuse for the art and to suppose that the topics which Jonson chooses to satirize are coextensive with rhetoric. There are plentiful notes and a long and useful bibliography. (D.C.B.)

KINO. Ibarra de Anda, F. El Padre Kino, misionero y gobernante. Colección de vidas mexicanas. 22. México. Ediciones Xóchitl. 1945.

Rev. by Fernando Anaya Monroy in RHA 24 (Diciembre 1947).416-7.

On the 17th century California missionary.

LAS CASAS. Morales Patiño, Oswaldo. Fray Bartolomé de las Casas. RBC 60 (1948).5-46.

A detailed biographical sketch with a good bibliography on pp. 34-46.

LIBANIUS. Pack, Roger. Note on a *Progymnasma* of Libanius. AJP 69 (1948).299-304.

LUTHER. Ubertazzi, G. Lutero. Milano. Garzanti.

MACHIAVELLI. Conde, Francisco Javier. El saber político en Maquiavelo. Madrid. Instituto Nacional de Estudios Jurídicos.

'The keystone of this study is an interpretation of Machiavellian wisdom as rhetoric, which presents the problem of the relationship between politics and rhetoric within the real and intellectual coordination of the modern state.'

Luciani, Vincent. Ralegh's *Discourse of war* and Machiavelli's *Dicsorsi*. MP 46 (1948).122-31.

Silió Cortés, César. Maquiavelo y su tiempo. Madrid. Espasa-Calpe. 1946.

Rev. by R.T.H. in BA 22 (1948).66-7.

MELITO. Wifstrand, A. The homily of Melito *On the passion*. VC 2 (1948). 201-23.

ORIGEN. Grant, Robert M. New fragments of the homilies of Origen. VC 2 (1948).161-2.

———. More fragments of Origen? VC 2 (1948).243-7.

PORTILLO. Roemer, Beatrice Blum. Portillo of Peru. MA 30 (1948).105-32.

On Father Jerónimo Ruiz del Portillo, 16th century founder of the Jesuit province of Peru.

ROGEL. Griffin, Rosemary Ring. Rogel, padre of the ports. MA 30 (1948). 3-43.

Preacher, teacher, and missionary of note, Father Juan Rogel was a Jesuit famous for his work in Florida, Spain, Havana, and Vera Cruz in the 16th century.

SADOLETO. Cassidy, Francis P. Educational theories and principles of Cardinal Jacopo Sadoleto. CER 46 (1948). 5-17; 83-94; 153-63; 219-31.

Pages 158-9 contain a brief account of the place of rhetoric in Sadoleto's system.

SAVONAROLA. Del Fante, A. Savonarola. Bologna. Del Fante.

MODERN PUBLIC ADDRESS

1. History, Culture

Baird, A. Craig, ed. Representative American speeches, 1947-1948. New York. H. W. Wilson.

Barnes, Arthur Morford. American intervention in Cuba and annexation of the Philippines: an analysis of the public discussion. Ph.D. dissertation. Cornell Univ. Graduate School.

Beard, Charles Austin, ed. The enduring Federalist. Garden City, New York. Doubleday.

An analysis of the Federalist papers of Hamilton, Madison, and Jay and their importance in terms of our national history. Eighty-five of the papers are included together with notes by the editor.

Bower, Robert T. Opinion research and historical interpretations of elections. POQ 12 (1948) .455-64.

Braden, Waldo W. The lecture movement: 1840-1860. QJS 34 (1948) .206-12.

Cantril, Hadley. Opinion trends in World War II: some guides to interpretation. POQ 12 (1948) .30-44.

Case, Victoria and Robert O. We called it culture. Garden City. Doubleday.

Rev. by Herbert Asbury in SRL 31 (February 14).18.

Culture in this case refers to Chautauqua, which left its imprint on the lives of millions of Americans from 1874 until the 1920's. More specifically the authors have treated only the 'tent circuit' phase which brought lectures, music, drama, and 'other cultural items' to many communities during the summers. The authors have caught the spirit of the movement, and they have written a readable and entertaining book. Some of the most interesting chapters are those concerning Russell Conwell and William Jennings Bryan.

However, much of the authors' analysis is superficial. We must wait for a more scholarly work to interpret the real significance of Chautauqua in all its aspects. Unfortunately the bibliography is extremely limited. No attempt is made to footnote the book. (W.W.B.)

Clark, Robert D. These truths we hold self-evident. QJS 34 (1948) .445-50.

A clear view of speech within a context of social values as well as rhetorical skills.

Clark, Thomas D. The country newspaper: a factor in southern opinion. JSH 14 (1948) .3-34.

Mentions many southern orators.

Croce, B. Le 'Istituzioni di eloquenza italiana' del Serio. QC (Marzo 1948). 96-9.

Of Luigi Serio and the influence of the schools of oratory on the republican movement in Naples at the close of the 18th century.

Dauer, Manning J. Recent southern political thought. JP 10 (1948) .327-53.

The political theories of Washington, Marshall, and John Taylor serve as background for an examination of the political thinking of Henry Grady, Tom Watson, Ellis Arnall, Claude Pepper, and others.

Davidson, Levette J. Folklore as a supplement to western history. NH 29 (1948) .3-16.

Contains a section on 'western vocabularies.'

Drummond, A. M. A dramatist looks at public speaking. QJS 34 (1948) .342-6.

Eysench, H. J., and Crown, S. National stereotypes: an experimental and methodological study. IJOAR 2 (1948) .26-37.

Subjects are urban, middle-class Londoners.

Flanagan, John T. Three allied arts. QJS 34 (1948) .30-5.

A statement of the coalescence of history, literature, and public address.

Gunderson, Robert G. A political and rhetorical study of the 1840 presidential campaign. Ph.D. dissertation. Univ. of Wisconsin Graduate School.

———. Presidential rally, 1840 style. Gavel 31 (1948) .8-9.

Account of the state Ohio Whig convention, from contemporary reports.

Lorulot, André. La libre pensée au micro: recueil des principales allocutions prononcées à la radiodiffusion nationale. Herblay (Seine-et-Oise). Editions de L'idée libre.

Luecke, Camilla Painter. The national archives. QJS 34 (1948) .347-9.

Survey of types of holdings: documents, films, sound recordings.

Luelmo, J. Los antiesclavistas norteamericanos: la cuestión de Texas y la guerra con México. Biblioteca Enciclopédica Popular. 181. México. Secretaría de Educación Pública. 1947.

Through its ministry of public education, Mexico is trying to educate its citizens by furnishing cultural readings and information with the series called Popular Encyclopedic Library. This volume has biographical sketches of and selections from Lincoln, Grant, Van Buren, John Quincy Adams, William Ellery Channing, Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, William Henry Seward, and Albert Gallatin. Their positions on slavery, the annexation of Texas, and the Mexican War are emphasized.

Meiklejohn, Alexander. Free speech and its relation to self government. New York. Harpers.

Micken, Ralph Arlington. A rhetorical study of the senate debates on the League of Nations. Ph.D. dissertation. Northwestern Univ. Graduate School.

Murray, James. The progress of speech instruction in American colleges and universities. WS 12-2 (1948) .3-10.

A brief sketch of courses of study and textbooks from 1636 to 1934.

Rarig, Frank M. Our speech and our inter-personal relations. QJS 34 (1948). 439-44.

Rayback, Joseph G. The liberty party leaders of Ohio: exponents of anti-slavery coalition. OSAHQ 57 (1948). 165-78.

Focuses on Salmon P. Chase in particular, but includes other political speakers, among them Lewis Tappan, Seward, James Birney.

Romberg, Annie. A Texas literary society of pioneer days. SHQ 52 (1948). 60-6.

Sansom, Clive, ed. Speech of our time. London. Hinrichsen.

Rev. in TLS (July 24).419.

Not available for examination. The following quotation is taken from the review in TLS. 'A number of experts and public speakers have contributed articles to this survey of speech [in Britain]. The articles, preceded by a brief general review of the problem by Mr. Clive Sansom, are classified under the main headings of Science and Speech; Speech Societies; Speech Education; Training; the Art of Speech; English Speech Abroad; and Speech Therapy. Each contribution is accompanied by suggestions for further reading. A Directory of Speech Societies, Schools, Academies and other connected organizations, a Who's Who of the contributors to the volume and a subject-index complete the survey.'

Smith, Bromley. Extracurricular disputations: 1400-1650. QJS 34 (1948). 473-6.

Intercollegiate and intramural disputations at Oxford and Cambridge.

Smith, T. V. In honor of oratory. QJS 34 (1948) .143-9.

An inquiry into the role of oratory in human affairs, exemplified by Hitler, Mussolini, Churchill, and Roosevelt.

Somit, Albert. The military hero as presidential candidate. POQ 12 (1948). 192-200.

Analysis of various campaigns discloses that military heroes have in general been more successful than civilian candidates in getting votes for the presidency.

Speier, Hans. The future of psychological warfare. POQ 12 (1948) .5-18.

Table analytique des débats parlementaires. Session de 1946 (du 28 novembre au 27 decembre 1946). Rédigée aux archives de l'Assemblée Nationale. Paris. Imprimerie des journaux officiels.

Texts of the debates in the recent constituent assembly which fashioned the present government of France.

Voorhis, Jerry. Effective speaking in congress. QJS 34 (1948) .462-3.

White, David M. Shakespeare and psychological warfare. POQ 12 (1948) .68-72.

Illustrates Shakespeare's understanding of the techniques.

Williams, Sir Herbert. The member of parliament and his constituency. PA 1 (1948) .49-55.

Selection, election, and function of the British MP.

Williams, Mentor L. 'A shout of derision': a sidelight on the presidential campaign of 1848. MH 32 (1948) .66-78.

A lucid account of the trials and tribulations of Lewis Cass in the campaign of 1848. Alludes to a sarcastic speech by Lincoln.

2. Theory

Baskerville, Barnet. A study of American criticism of public address 1850-1900. Ph.D. dissertation. Northwestern Univ. Graduate School.

Brandenburg, Earnest. Quintilian and the good orator. QJS 34 (1948) .23-9.

The moral character of the speaker in the total evaluation by the rhetorical critic.

Britton, Wayne Lorraine. An analytical study of the abilities of a group of University of Iowa freshmen in certain

selected aspects of the organization of ideas and materials for communication. Ph.D. dissertation. Univ. of Iowa Graduate School.

Bryson, Lyman, ed. The communication of ideas: a series of addresses. New York. Harper.

Bühler, E. Lenguaje, el modelo del *organon*. E 55 (1947) .265-78.

Cassirer, E. El lenguaje y la creación del mundo de objetos. E 55 (1947) .231-63.

Chein, Isidor. Behavior theory and the behavior of attitudes: some critical comments. PR 55 (1948) .175-88.
Includes appraisal of Doob's definitions.

Cortright, Rupert L. The challenges we face. SSJ 14 (1948) .33-9.
The significance of communication, in the broadest sense, in the modern world.

Dale, Edgar, and Chall, Jeanne S. A formula for predicting readability. ERB 27 (1948) .11-20, 37-54.

Dale, Edgar, and Hager, Hilda. How to write to be understood. ERB 27 (1948) .207-16.

Edwards, R. Stafford. Words are dynamite. JAP 32 (1948) .370-3.
Loaded words in labor-management relations.

Flesch, Rudolf. A new readability yardstick. JAP 32 (1948) .221-33.
Modification of formulas described in *The art of plain talk*.

Fruchter, Benjamin. The nature of verbal fluency. EPM 8 (1948) .33-47.

Gerwirtz, Jacob L. Studies in word fluency: I. Its relations to vocabulary and mental age in young children; II. Its relation to eleven items of child behavior. PS 72 (1948) .165-76; 177-84.

Goodhartz, Abraham S. Student attitudes and opinions relating to teaching at Brooklyn College. S&S 68 (1948) .345-9.
Includes data on speaking ability.

Green, Charles Price. Conceptions of rhetorical delivery. Ph.D. dissertation. Northwestern Univ. Graduate School.

Guthrie, Warren. The development of rhetorical theory in America, 1635-1850. SM 15 (1948) .61-71.
Third, and final, monograph on this topic. See SM 13 (1946).14-22; and SM 14 (1947).38-51.

Haiman, Franklyn S. An experiment in informative speaking. QJS 34 (1948) .355-60.
A comparison of speakers of average and superior skill and personality presenting technical material to an already motivated audience.

———. An experimental study of the effects of ethos in public speaking. Ph.D. dissertation. Northwestern Univ. Graduate School.

Harris, Chester W. A factor analysis of selected senate roll calls, 80th congress. EPM 8 (1948) .583-91.
Illustrates application of factorial methods to analysis of opinions.

Henrikson, Ernest H. A study of stage fright and the judgment of speaking time. JAP 32 (1948) .532-6.

Herrick, Marvin T. The place of rhetoric in poetic theory. QJS 34 (1948) .1-22.

Hochmuth, Marie. Speech and society. BNAP 32 (1948) .17-33.
This admirable article establishes a solid foundation for the conviction that qualities fostered by training in discussion and other forms of talk are essential to the salvation of society. Drawing upon much of the best contemporary thought concerning the ills of humanity, Miss Hochmuth portrays a world in flux, marked by social disintegration and personal instability. The great need is for cooperation in common tasks, with the restoration of the psychic harmony that comes from a sense of adequacy in community effort. Therefore all the people, and not merely a selected few, should be equipped with the tools for orderly procedures in group relationships and the psychological disciplines necessary for cooperation. In speech training, and particularly in discussion, will be found the best means of providing these tools and disciplines. (N.W.M.)

Howell, William S. Critical thinking and persuasion. Gavel 30 (1948) .67-72.

Joachim, Harold H. Logical studies. Oxford. Clarendon Press.

Klapp, Orrin E. The creation of the popular hero. AJS 54 (1948) .135-41.
In part, a study of audience psychology.

Lachance, Louis, O. P. Philosophie du langage. Paris. J. Vrin.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. Some remarks on the role of mass media in so-called tolerance propaganda. JSI 3 (1947) .17-25.
Contrasts mass media techniques with face-to-face contacts.

Lee, Irving J. Freedom from speech. SSJ 14 (1948) .27-32.
The need for viability, as well as sincerity and conviction, in debating social problems.

Lewis, M.M. Language in society: the linguistic revolution and social change. New York. Social Sciences.

Lowenthal, Leo, and Guterman, Norbert. Portrait of the American agitator. POQ 12 (1948) .417-29.
Supplies some answers to these questions: what are agitators? how do they gain their followings? when do they appear?

Nichols, Roy F. Unfinished business. PMHB 72 (1948) .109-15.
'In the study of American political history there has been too great a concentration on the national, the constitutional, and the theoretical. Much time has been spent in analyzing political debates, in arranging ideas according to theoretical schema, and in concentrating on what one might call the shadowboxing of political debate. In so doing, basic research in political behavoir has been neglected.'

Phelps, Austin. The theory of preaching. Abridged and revised by Faris Daniel Whitesel. Grand Rapids, Mich. W. B. Eerdmans. 1947.

Richards, Ivor Armstrong. El poder de las palabras. E 55 (1947) .279-306.

Rosales, Luis. Algunas consideraciones sobre el lenguaje. E 55 (1947) .363-436.

Sayre, Woodrow W. Communication as a first principle in philosophy. QJS 34 (1948) .128-36.

Schoekel, Alonso. La formación del estilo. Santander. Bibliotheca Comillenses. 1947.

Schramm, Wilbur, ed. Communications in modern society. Fifteen studies of the mass media prepared for the University of Illinois Institute of Communications Research. Urbana. Univ. of Illinois.

Smith, George Horsley. Liberalism and level of information. JExP 39 (1948) . 65-81.
Are liberalism and information correlated on non-economic and politico-economic questions?

Stodgill, Ralph M. Personal factors associated with leadership: a survey of the literature. JPsy 25 (1948) .35-71.
Includes studies on 'fluency of speech.'

Thonssen, Lester, and Baird, A. Craig. Speech criticism: the development of standards for rhetorical appraisal. New York. Ronald.
Rev. by Karl R. Wallace in QJS 34 (1948). 510-5.

Two well-known scholars in public address make a unique contribution to rhetorical studies in this pioneer historical and critical survey of rhetorical theory and the theory and practice of rhetorical criticism. After an introductory chapter on the Nature of Rhetorical Criticism (Part I), directed at a reader midway between the uninitiated and the nascent scholar, there follow three chapters summarizing the Development of Rhetorical Theory (Part II) from the earliest days in Greece to the present time, and three chapters surveying historically the Methods of the Critics (Part III) of speakers and speaking from antiquity on down. This occupies the first 286 pages. The remaining 185 pages of the text develop descriptively and critically a theory and practice for the criticism of speeches. Under Part IV, Preliminary Aspects of Rhetorical Criticism, fall the chapters on Determining the Areas of Investigation, Establishing the Authenticity of Texts, and Reconstructing the Social Settings. Part V, the Standards of Judgment, treats from a critic's point of view the concepts of logical proof, emotion, character, structure, style, and delivery. Here also are discussed the measures of effectiveness in speaking. Part VI presents an essay towards a philosophy of rhetoric. Notes and an index are appended, as is also the customary textbook machinery of questions, problems, and suggested readings.

There can be no question of the preeminent value of this book—the first and only one of its kind. It would be captious, therefore, to complain that in their attempt to do all, Thons-

sen and Baird have left some things out and have slighted others. They have given competent but floundering scholars and theorists—either their contemporaries or their successors—a frame in which to work and ideas to correct or develop. It is offered only as one reader's opinion, therefore, that their conception of the general critical function is more utilitarian and has less philosophical scope than the heart might desire, and that their practice in the historical portions of citing the judgments of others in preference to stating their own amounts almost to ostentation in reverse. (D.C.B.)

Tousey, Gail Jordan. McGuffey's elocutionary teachings. QJS 34 (1948) .80-7.

Vartburg, Walter von. La palabra y su ambiente. E 55 (1947) .307-35.

Walter, Otis M., Jr. The measurement of ethos. Ph.D. dissertation. Northwestern Univ. Graduate School.

Welford, A. T. The use of archaic language in religious expression: an example of 'canalized response.' BJP 38 (1948) .209-17.

Experimental work to test preferences for the authorized version and more modern texts.

3. Platform Address

a. *Practitioners*

ALCALA GALIANO. Ximenez de Sandoval, Felipe. Antonio Alcalá Galiano. Intro. by Gregorio Maranon. Madrid. Espasa-Calpe.

A life of the restless Spanish orator and politician whose memoirs are a slice of the turbulent history of the early 19th century.

ANGELIS. Angelis, Pedro de. Acusación y defensa de Rosas. Biblioteca histórica del pensamiento americano. Buenos Aires. La Facultad. 1945.

Rev. by Harry Bernstein in HAHR 28 (1948).111-2.

Contains speeches by the official mouthpiece of the dictatorship of the 19th century Argentinian Rosas.

BELLO. Grases, Pedo. Andrés Bello: el primer humanista de América. Buenos Aires. Ediciones del Tridente. 1946.

Rev. by John Kenneth Leslie in HAHR 28 (1948).282.

BENTON. Lewis, Thomas Robert. Persuasive techniques of Thomas Hart Benton as a congressional debater, 1828-1840. Ph.D. dissertation. Univ. of Iowa Graduate School.

BERULLE. Molien, A. Le cardinal de Bérulle. 2 vols. Paris. Beauchesne et ses Fils.

BLAIR. Schmitz, Robert Morell. Hugh Blair. New York. King's Crown.

Rev. by D. C. Bryant in QJS 34 (1948).382.

This is the first significant biography, and an excellent, scholarly one, of the celebrated 18th century professor of rhetoric, author of the *Lectures on rhetoric and belles lettres,* and the most popular conservative preacher of the Edinburgh of his day. Mr. Schmitz's chief attention is given to bringing to life the professor, the preacher, the literary and social arbiter—in short the famous Dr. Blair. Thus he provides a sound foundation for the understanding and appraisal of Blair in each of his major functions. There is much of value here, therefore, for the student of rhetorical theory and of preaching, even though Mr. Schmitz's treatment of the *Lectures* and of Blair's preaching is deliberately synoptic and characterizing rather than analytical and thorough. He finds the *Lectures* 'safely reactionary,' and in the sermons 'a kind of eloquent gentleness'—both completely in keeping with the man and the time. Excellent bibliographies. (D.C.B.)

BOLIVAR. Bolivar, Simón. Obras completas. Compilación y notas de Vicente Lecuna, con la colaboración de la señorita Esther Barret de Nazaris. 2 vols. La Habana. Editorial Lex. 1947.

Rev. by Rafael Heliodoro Valle in RHA 25 (Junio 1948).187-9.

Sáenz. See 'Morelos.'

Trend, John Brande. Bolivar and the independence of Spanish America. New York. Macmillan.

BRYAN. Buehler, E. C. William Jennings Bryan—an eye-witness report. Gavel 30 (1948) .43-4.

Case. See Modern Public Address—History, Culture.

CALHOUN. Capers, Gerald M. A reconsideration of John C. Calhoun's transition from nationalism to nullification. JSH 14 (1948) .34-49.

Refutes the idea that expediency influenced Calhoun and gives a clear analysis of his political motives.

Rayback, Joseph G. The presidential ambitions of John C. Calhoun, 1844-1848. JSH 14 (1948) .331-57.

New information on Calhoun, William Yancey, Jefferson Davis, Thomas Clingman, and others.

CAMPBELL. Edney, C. W. George Campbell's theory of logical truth. SM 15 (1948) .19-32.

CANNON. Lucas, William Dennis. A study of the speaking and debating of Joseph Gurney Cannon. Ph.D. dissertation. Northwestern Univ. Graduate School.

CASS. Williams. See Modern Public Address—History, Culture.

CAVOUR. De Marchi, E. Il pensiero costituzionale del Cavour. Milano. La Fiaccola.

CHASE. Rayback. See Modern Public Address—History, Culture.

CHURCHILL. Gulley, Halbert Edison. A study of selected speeches on relations with Germany delivered by Winston Spencer Churchill in the House of Commons, 1935-1938. Ph.D. dissertation. Univ. of Iowa Graduate School.

In guerra. Discorsi. Milano. Rizzoli.

Smith, T. V. See Modern Address—History, Culture.

COCKRAN. McGurrin, James. Bourke Cockran. New York. Scribners.

Rev. by John L. Corcoran in CHR 34(1948).372; by Herbert D. A. Donavan in NYH 29 (1948).445-6.

This biography focuses upon the personal triumphs of a great Irish-American speaker. The study is not scholarly. As an encomium, the work draws from a multitude of sources the materials which contribute to the persuasive purpose of the whole.

Mr. McGurrin devotes many pages to reviews of Cockran's outstanding speeches but exercises little critical evaluation. The work may be useful for its descriptions of speaking situations, but it remains a history of a speaker's ability to give effectiveness to himself. The means by which the speaker's message was made effective are not explored. (C.C.A.)

DEBS. Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., ed. Writings and speeches of Eugene V. Debs. New York. Hermitage.

Contains twelve speeches delivered between 1895 and 1918. The subjects covered include union organization, politics, and war. The editor does not comment upon the source or probable validity of the speech texts published. The writings reprinted here are editorials, essays, and excerpts from books and pamphlets. (C.C.A.)

DESMOULINS. Labracherie, Pierre. Camille Desmoulins: grandeur et misère d'une âme ardente. Collection Le rayon d'histoire. Paris. Hachette.

DEWEY. Behl, William A. The 1948 presidential campaign speakers: Thomas E. Dewey. QJS 34 (1948) .303-7.

———. The 1948 presidential campaign: Thomas E. Dewey. QJS 34 (1948) .425-31.

DICKINSON. Young, James Harvey. A woman abolitionist views the south in 1875. GHQ 32 (1948) .241-51.

The 'Queen of the Lyceum,' Miss Dickinson, abolitionist, bitter foe of Lincoln, and radical reconstructionist, is pictured on a lecture tour to southern cities in 1875.

DOLLIVER. Eminent Iowan—Jonathan P. Dolliver. AI 29 (1948) .335-65.

Four essays appear under the general title given above: 'Possessed rare oratorical ability,' by William R. Boyd; 'Dolliver as a campaigner,' by George M. Titus; 'Dolliver's new alignment,' by Addison Parker; and 'Dolliver's justification,' by Emory H. English.

EMMET. Landreth, Helen. The pursuit of Robert Emmet. New York. McGraw-Hill.

Rev. by Richard Watts in NR 118 (February 18).25-6; by F. J. Haynes in SRL 31 (May 8).15; by B. M. O'Reilly in CaW 166 (1948).568.

Main emphasis is given to a study of Emmet's part as a leader in the ill-fated Irish revolt of 1803, which ended in Emmet's capture and hanging. A most dramatic section is that which describes the events of Emmet's trial and his famous extemporaneous speech given immediately before he received sentence. The study is based upon careful research in sources previously not open to scholars. (W.W.B.)

EVARTS. Beall, Paul R. The forensic rhetoric of William Maxwell Evarts. Ph.D. dissertation. Pennsylvania State College Graduate School.

FLORES MAGON. Flores Magón, Ricardo and Jesús. Batalla a la dictadura: textos politicos. El liberalismo mexicano en pensamiento y en acción. Mexico. Empresas editoriales.

The political speeches of early labor organizers and precursors of the great Mexican social revolution of 1910-1920 aimed principally at the destruction of the dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz.

GARCIA MORENO. Gálvez, Manuel. Vida de don Gabriel García Moreno. Madrid. Gráficas González. 1945.

Rev. by Richard Pattee in HAHR 28 (1948). 98-100.

On the life of a 19th century dictator of Ecuador.

GOMEZ. Pabón Núñez, Lucio. El presidente de la IX conferencia. RIn 102 (Marzo-Mayo 1948) .413-21.

On Laureano Gómez, Colombian foreign minister, president of the Pan American Conference of Bogotá in 1948 and one of Latin America's outstanding orators of the present day.

GOMEZ FARIAS. Fuentes Díaz, Vicente. Gómez Farías, padre de la Reforma. México. Xóchitl.

On a 19th century Mexican vice-president famous for his liberal reforms.

HAMILTON. Beard. See Modern Public Address—History, Culture.

HARRISON, B. Dozer, Donald Marquand. Benjamin Harrison and the presidential campaign of 1892. AHR 54 (1948) .49-77.

Harrison is praised as a speaker; his failure to be reelected is laid to other forces. Also mentioned are Depew, Foraker, Blaine, and others.

HITLER. Smith, T. V. See Modern Public Address—History, Culture.

ITURBIDE. Cuevas, Mariano. El libertador: documentos selectos de D. Augustin de Iturbide. México. Editorial Patria. 1947.

Rev. by William S. Robertson in HAHR 28 (1948).85-7.

JAY. Beard. See Modern Public Address—History, Culture.

JOHNSON. Nichols, Egbert Ray, Jr. An investigation of the contributions of the public speaking of Hiram W. Johnson to his political career. Ph.D. dissertation. Univ. of Southern California Graduate School.

JUAREZ. Roeder, Ralph. Juárez and his Mexico. 2 vols. New York. Viking Press. 1947.

Rev. by Walter V. Scholes in HAHR 28 (1948).229-30.

A scholarly biography of Mexico's president at the time of the French intervention.

LA FOLLETTE. Hesseltine, William B. Robert Marion La Follette and the principles of Americanism. WMH 31 (1948) .261-7.

LA GUARDIA. La Guardia, Fiorello H. The making of an insurgent. Philadelphia. Lippincott.

This autobiography covers the years 1882-1919, and contains some indications of the sources from which La Guardia's leading ideas were derived. The book is by no means deeply revealing, yet it contains a number of useful clues concerning La Guardia's tactics and strategy as a forensic, deliberative, and campaign speaker. (C.C.A.)

LAMAR. Streeter, Donald Clint. A rhetorical criticism of the major public addresses of Lucius Q. C. Lamar during the period 1874 to 1890. Ph.D. dissertation. Univ. of Iowa Graduate School.

LINCOLN. Angle, Paul M., ed. Abraham Lincoln: his autobiographical writings now brought together for the first time and prefaced with an introductory comment. New Brunswick. Rutgers Univ. Press.

Autobiographical excerpts from speeches and letters woven into a continuous story. Limited edition of 425 copies.

Clark. See Pulpit Address—Practitioners, *s.v.* 'Simpson.'

Hesseltine, William B. Lincoln and the war governors. New York. Knopf.

Rev. by Howard C. Perkins in JSH 24 (1948).556-8; by Arthur J. Larsen in MnH 29 (1948).342-3.

Professor Hesseltine analyzes the way which Lincoln gained control of the Republican party and made the federal government all powerful during the war years. In 1860 Lincoln was elected, not by a strong national organization, but by state organizations largely dominated by the governors. These state groups had little in common except their desire to elect a president. As the war progressed Lincoln astutely outmaneuvered and outwitted his self-appointed bosses, the governors. The result, Mr. Hesseltine points out, was that Lincoln rose to undisputed leadership of the party, and states' rights gave way to federalism.

In addition to giving fresh insight into Lincoln's political shrewdness, this study lifts from oblivion many interesting men worthy of the attention of the student of public address. (W.W.B.)

Jones, Edgar DeWitt. Lincoln and the preachers. New York. Harper.

The Reverend Dr. Jones has written 'a book about Abraham Lincoln and the spiritual leaders of his day who for one reason or another entered into his life.' The work does not demonstrate that Lincoln drew his spiritual ideas from any of these leaders.

Students of public address will be most interested in the chapter 'The Speech of Lincoln.' Here the author has brought into play critical powers too often lacking in the discussions of Lincoln's ecclesiastical acquaintances. The chapters on Peter Cartwright and Owen Lovejoy may also be useful as reminders of the wide influence of such frontier preacher-politicians. (C.C.A.)

Riddle, Donald W. Lincoln runs for congress. New Brunswick. Rutgers Univ. Press.

Rev. by William B. Hesseltine in MVRH 35 (1948).513-4.

Professor Riddle's excellent little volume substantiates the thesis that Lincoln was an astute 'manager of men.' The work offers a detailed study of Lincoln's campaigns for the Whig congressional nomination and for election in 1846. The selection of campaign issues and the methods by which Lincoln held control of his demoralized party are followed in detail.

Only an analysis of campaign speaking is missing from this study of politics in microcosm. For this omission the author is blameless, since Lincoln made few formal speeches during the campaigns and none of these was reported or otherwise preserved. The study, nonetheless, sheds considerable light on the qualities which enabled Lincoln to manage men from the rostrum. (C.C.A.)

Williams. See Modern Public Address—History, Culture.

MACAULAY. Lord Macaulay's legislative minutes. Ed. by C. D. Dharker. New York. Oxford.

MADISON. Beard. See Modern Public Address—History, Culture.

Brant, Irving. James Madison: the nationalist, 1780-1787. Indianapolis. Bobbs-Merrill.

Rev. by John T. Horton in AHR 54 (1948).153-4.

The first volume of Brant's long biography, *James Madison: the Virginia revolutionist, 1751-1780*, was published in 1941. In the present volume, the author has analyzed Madison's influence on the formation of the new government. Madison is pictured as a radical working for democratic reform. (W.W.B.)

MIRABEAU. Chevallier, Jean-Jacques. Mirabeau: un grand destin manque. Paris. Librairie Hachette. 1947.

Rev. by Mitchell B. Garrett in AHR 53 (1948).810-1.

This work has not been available for examination, but it is reported to be a study superior to Vallentin's *Mirabeau*. (See *infra*.)

Vallentin, Antonina. Mirabeau. A translation by E. W. Dikes. New York. Viking.

Rev. by Mitchell B. Garrett in SAQ 47 (1948).593-4.

The author of this long biography sets forth with clarity the complicated story of Mirabeau's career. She devotes much attention to Mirabeau's persuasive achievements in public and private speech, but, apart from showing that his rhetorical artistry stemmed from incessant study and from a phenomenal memory, she does not attempt to analyze the sources of his power. The work is reportorial rather than interpretative and is, within these limits, an excellent study based upon original sources. (C.C.A.)

MORAZAN. Mejía Nieto, Arturo. Morazán, presidente de la desaparecida república centroamericana. Colección Los Hombres Representativos. Buenos Aires. Editorial Nova. 1947.

Rev. by Rafael Heliodoro Valle in RHA 25 (Junio 1948).224-7.

Zúñiga Huete, Angel. Morazán. Un representativo de la democracia americana. México, D. F. Ediciones Botas. 1947.

Rev. by Rafael Heliodoro Valle in RHA 24 (Diciembre 1947).452-4.

MORELOS. Sáenz, V. Morelos y Bolívar. México. Sociedad Bolivariana. 1947.

MUSSOLINI. Rossi, C. Mussolini com' era. Roma. Ruffolo.

Smith, T. V. See Modern Public Address—History, Culture.

PROUDHON. Halévy, Daniel, et Sainte-Beuve, Charles Augustin de. La vie de Proudhon. I. 1809-47. Paris. Delamain et Boutelleau.

Rev. by André Rousseau in FL 23(Octobre). 2.

Volume I of a projected biography of the eminent controversialist of the French socialist movement, consisting of: 1. La jeunesse de Proudhon, 1809-37, par Daniel Halévy; 2. Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, 1837-48, par Sainte-Beuve; 3. Appendice et commentaires par Daniel Halévy.

ROOSEVELT, F. D. Brandenburg, Earnest S. An analysis and criticism of Franklin D. Roosevelt's speeches on international affairs delivered between September 3, 1939, and December 7, 1941. Ph.D. dissertation. Univ. of Iowa Graduate School.

Crowell, Laura Irene. An analysis of audience persuasion in the major addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt in the presidential campaign of 1936. Ph.D. dissertation. Univ. of Iowa Graduate School.

Farley, James A. Jim Farley's story: the Roosevelt years. New York. McGraw-Hill.

An autobiographical account of the author's associations with the Roosevelt administration. Naturally the treatment is biased, but it throws much light on the inner workings of the administrative branch of our government and on the operation of a political party. Furthermore, it gives many interesting bits concerning speeches delivered during the period. (W.W.B.)

Ludwig, Emilio. Roosevelt. Milano. Mondadori. 1947.

Rev. by Ugo Sardo in It 31 (1948).33.

Roosevelt, Elliott, ed. F.D.R.: his personal papers. Vol. 2. 1905-1928. New York. Duell, Sloan and Pearce.

Rev. by Lloyd Morris in NR 119 (December 27).23-4.

Roz, Firmin. Roosevelt. Collection Les constructeurs. Paris. Dunod.

Sherwood, Robert E. Roosevelt and Hopkins, an intimate history. New York. Harper.

Rev. by Henry Steele Commanger in NYTB (October 24).1; by Elmer Davis in SRL 31 (October 23).7-9, 35-38.

An indispensable book for the student of Franklin D. Roosevelt's speech-making. The Hopkins files from which Sherwood has drawn the bulk of his material cover the period from 1940 to 1945. There are also preliminary chapters on Hopkins' earlier life.

Information about Roosevelt as a speech maker is diffused throughout. Chapter VIII is especially interesting since it is concerned almost entirely with Roosevelt's speech making problems in the third term campaign. Chapter IX details the labors of speech preparation by the quadrumvirate: Roosevelt, Hopkins, Rosenman, and Sherwood.

The 960 pages of text are heavily documented with excerpts from speeches, memoranda, letters, paraphrases of unreleased documents and cables, and pages from Hopkins' own diaries. Footnotes to the text and a complete index appear at the end. (R.R.C.)

Shipman, Fred W. The Roosevelt papers. QJS 34 (1948).137-42.

General survey of holdings of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, N. Y.

Smith, T. V. See Modern Public Address—History, Culture.

SAINT-JUST. Saint-Just, Louis de. Pages choisies. Introduction par Jean Casson. Collection Incidences. 5. Paris. Editions du Point du Jour. 1947.

SARMIENTO. A Sarmiento anthology. Translated by Stuart Edgar Grumman. Ed. by Allison Williams Bunkley. Princeton. Princeton Univ. Press.

Rev. by Irving A. Leonard in HAHR 28 (1948).435-8.

SHERIDAN, R. B. Gibbs, Lewis. Sheridan against Hastings. QJS 34 (1948). 464-8.

A summary, with emphasis upon the occasion, of Sheridan's speeches of 1787-1788.

SIERRA. Ferrer, Gabriel. Justo Sierra. México. Ediciones Xóchitl. 1947.

Rev. by Rubén M. Landa in BA 22 (1948). 258; by George I. Sánchez in HAHR 28 (1948).278.

Urueta. See 'Urueta.'

STASSEN. Alexander, Frederick G. The 1948 presidential campaign speakers: Harold E. Stassen. QJS 34 (1948).314-6.

TAFT. Crocker, Lionel. The 1948 presidential campaign speakers: Robert A. Taft. QJ S34 (1948).311-3.

THIERS. Pomaret, Charles. Monsieur Thiers et son siècle. Collection La suite des temps. 19. Paris. Gallimard.

Roux, Georges. Thiers. Paris. Nouvelles Éditions Latines.

TILLMAN. Perkins, Lindsey S. The oratory of Benjamin Ryan Tillman. SM 15 (1948).1-18.

TORRES BODET, J. Educación y concordia internacional: discursos y mensajes. 1941-1947. México. El Colegio de México.

Speeches by Mexico's former foreign minister and present president of UNESCO.

TRUMAN. Randolph, Jennings. The 1948 presidential campaign speakers: Harry S. Truman. QJS 34 (1948).300-2.

———. The 1948 presidential campaign: Truman—a winning speaker. QJS 34 (1948).421-4.

TWAIN. Coleman, Rufus A. Trowbridge and Clemens. MLQ 9 (1948). 216-23.

Contains John Townsend Trowbridge's adverse comments on several of Mark Twain's speeches.

URUETA, J. Discurso sobre Justo Sierra. Morelia, Mich. Univ. Michoacana.

A speech by Mexico's foremost orator of the 20th century on another famous orator.

VANDENBERG. Oliver, Robert T. The 1948 presidential campaign speakers: Arthur H. Vandenberg. QJS 34 (1948).317-21.

VARAS. Céspedes, Mario. Don Antonio Varas en el Instituto Nacional. At 90 (1948).63-76.

On a 19th century professor, journalist, lawyer, statesman, and orator, and his influence on the shaping of policies for the famous school, the Instituto Nacional of Chile, of which he was president.

VASQUEZ. Shiels, W. Eugene. Francisco Pablo Vásquez and the independence of México. MA 30 (1948). 177-86.

On the efforts of a 19th century priest, preacher, statesman, and orator to bring about the independence of Mexico and to defend the rights of the Catholic Church.

WALLACE. Hochmuth, Marie. The 1948 presidential campaign speakers: Henry A. Wallace. QJS 34 (1948).322-6.

Macdonald, Dwight. Henry Wallace: the man and the myth. New York. Vanguard.

Rev. by Robert Bendiner in N 166 (March 6).279-80.

This examination of Henry A. Wallace as a political leader is neither the unscrupulous calumny alleged by Mr. Wallace's friends nor the objective analysis alleged by the author. The book is journalistic rather than scholarly.

Since Mr. Wallace's public position rests heavily upon his writing and speaking, the author has engaged in much rhetorical criticism, particularly with reference to invention. Final judgments expressed in the book may be open to serious criticism, but the volume remains one which no serious student of Mr. Wallace's public speaking can safely ignore. (C.C.A.)

WARREN. Chapin, Leland. The 1948 presidential campaign speakers: Earl Warren. QJS 34 (1948).308-10.

WILSON. Turnbull, Laura Sheaver. Woodrow Wilson, a selected bibliography of his published writings, addresses, and public papers. Princeton. Princeton Univ. Press.

A 155 page bibliography listing 1248 items. Students of public address will find here an excellent list of Wilson's numerous speeches. Title, place and date of delivery, and location of text are given for each. (W.W.B.)

4. Pulpit Address

a. *General: History, Surveys*

Bessodes, Abbé Maurice. Sermons pour le temps présent. Tome I. Partie d'hiver. Vaison-la-romaine. Editions Bonne Presse du Midi.

Engel, Chne. Jean. Insta opportune: sermons pour tous les dimanches de l'année. Traduits par l'abbé Marcel Grandclaudon. Collection La prédication nouvelle. Mulhouse Editions Salvator.

Jones, Edgar De Witt. See Modern Public Address—Practitioners, *s.v.* 'Lincoln.'

McCartney, Eugene S. Notes on reading and praying audibly. CP 43 (1948). 184-7.

Prédication et prédicateurs, par P. Charles, S.J.; R. Leys, S.J.; L. Stenglhamber, S.J.; et Silens. Cahiers de la Nouvelle revue théologique. Paris. Casterman.

Roschini, Gabriele. Conferenze Mariane, trasmesse dalla Radio Vaticana. Rovigo. Istituto Padano d'Arti Grafiche.

Rev. by Arnolfo Santelli in It 31 (1948).186.

The talks given over the Vatican radio on the subject of the Virgin Mary by the best known religious authority on such theological matters.

Van Wyk, William P. My sermon notes on Old Testament characters. Grand Rapids. Baker Book House.

b. *Practitioners*

AFFRE. Blanchet, Mgr. Mgr. Affre et son temps. Paris. Bonne Presse.

Biographical account of the eloquent priest who was killed on the barricades in 1848 while delivering a speech.

BOSSUET. Bossuet, Jacques Bénigne. Sermons et oraisons funèbres (extraits) : avec une notice biographique, une notice historique et littéraire, des notes explicatives et des sujets de devoirs, par Louis G. Foissac. Tome I. L'idée de la providence. Tome II. L'idée de la mort. Collection Classiques français et étrangers. 29, 30. Paris. Editions Diderot.

CAMPBELL, A. Ellis, Carroll. Alexander Campbell as a preacher. SSJ 14 (1948) .99-107.

The rhetorical techniques of this outstanding lecturer, debater, and Christian leader, 1787-1866.

EDWARDS. Miller, Perry. Jonathan Edwards' sociology of the great awakening. NEQ 21 (1948) .50-77.

Edwards' thinking and preaching; his relations with George Whitefield, John Cotton, and Charles Chauncy.

FOSDICK. Brees, Paul Rexford. A comparative study of the devices of persuasion used in ten sermons by Harry Emerson Fosdick and eight sermons by William Ashley Sunday. Ph.D. dissertation. Univ. of Southern California Graduate School.

MILLER. Weniger, Charles Elliott. A critical analysis and appraisal of the public address of William Miller, early American Second Advent lecturer. Ph.D. dissertation. Univ. of Southern California Graduate School.

PARKER. Dirks, John Edward. The critical theology of Theodore Parker. New York. Columbia Univ. Press.

Rev. by Edmund S. Morgan in NEQ 21 (1948).405-6.

The fundamental question which the author attempts to answer is 'to what extent did Theodore Parker embrace New England Transcendentalism?' This study throws considerable light on Parker's *inventio*. (W.W.B.)

SIMPSON. Clark, Robert D. Bishop Matthew Simpson and the emancipation proclamation. MVHR 35 (1948). 263-71.

Shows the influence on Lincoln of this eloquent Methodist leader.

STERNE. Hammond, Lansing Van der Heyden. Lawrence Sterne's sermons of Mr. Yorick. New Haven. Yale.

SUNDAY. Brees. See Pulpit Address—Practitioners, *s.v.* 'Fosdick.'

SWING. Williams, Harry M. David Swing: the voice of music hall. SM 15 (1948) .44-60.

Liberal minister who led Chicago's most famous independent church in the 19th century.

WHITEFIELD. White, Eugene E. The preaching of George Whitefield during the great awakening in America. SM 15 (1948) .33-43.

5. Radio Address

a. *General: History, Effects, Techniques*

Ackerman, William C. U. S. radio: a record of a decade. POQ 12 (1948) .440-54.

Offers a concise summary of the highlights and trends of broadcasting during the past ten years.

Adam, Michel. Dictionnaire de radiotechnique français, anglais, allemand: dictionnaire de radiotechnique en trois langues, illustré et complété par lexique allemand-français, lexique anglais-français. Paris. Librairie de la Radio.

Beville, Hugh M., Jr., and Greene, Ken. A new look at radio audience measurement. PI (May 14) .38-9.

Bryson, Lyman. Radio in America. AS 17 (1948) .221-9.

Contains an explanation of certain practices of broadcasters and makes a plea for more intelligent criticism of radio.

Crosby, John. Radio and who makes it. AtM 181 (1948) .23-9.

Resistance to new ideas and fear of experiment have combined to bring American radio almost to a standstill. Aggressive leadership by the broadcasters themselves and less control by advertisers constitute the recommended cure.

Dallaire, Victor. How stunts build radio listenership. PI (February 20) .62-9.

Durr, Clifford J. The voice in democracy. Vital Speeches (May 1) .443-5.

Hanna, M. R. Radio investment in goodwill. NR (September 6) .28-30.

Harness, Forest A. The FCC still needs investigation. Public Utilities Fortnightly (December 16) .1-8.

The author, chairman of the Select Committee to Investigate the Federal Communications Committee of the United States House of Representatives, reveals some of the material his committee has uncovered.

Hollenbeck, Don. CBS views the press. AtM 182 (1948) .49-51.

A discussion of the CBS program which examined the reporting and interpreting of news by New York's newspapers.

Hudson, Robert B., and Wiebe, Gerhart D. A case for listener participation. POQ 12 (1948) .201-8.

Make the listener a participant rather than an eavesdropper in radio discussions.

Kaltenborn, Rolf. Can anything be done for American radio? SRL (January 31) .6-7.

Presents a strong case for subscription radio.

Knepper, Max. Why broadcasting has failed. Forum 109 (1948) .7-10.

After analyzing the American broadcasting scene, the author suggests we need more stations in the U.S. modelled after WNYC, New York.

Lyon, Don W. Is radio announcing a profession? QJS 34 (1948) .337-41.

Morse, Arthur D. Radio: battle of the ratings. N (October 2) .372-3.

A comparison of Hooperatings with those of the Nielsen Radio Index. Strongly favors the latter.

Seldes, Gilbert. How dense is the mass? AtM 182 (1948) .23-7.

Presents the fallacy of radio and movie thinking in reducing their offerings to meet 'average' appeal.

Siepmann, Charles A. The shortage of news analysts. N (January 24) .96-7.

———. Shall radio take sides? N (February 21) .210-11.

Smith, Walter C. Broadcasting in peace and war. CoR 173 (1948) .47-50.

Summers, Harrison B. The 1948 presidential campaign: radio in the 1948 campaign. QJS 34 (1948) .432-8.

Wechsler, Lewis S. To use or not to use the irritation technique in radio advertising. PI (May 14) .36-8.

Is the resentment aroused by an irritating commercial transferred to the product? The author believes that it is.

b. *Experimental Studies*

Chall, Jeanne S., and Dial, Harold E. Predicting listener understanding and interest in newscasts. ERB 27 (1948) . 141-53, 168.

Laybourn, G. P., and Longstaff, H. P. College students' opinions of radio advertising. JAP 32 (1948) .81-7.

Rothney, John W. M., and Hansen, Martin H. Evaluation of radio instruction in inter-cultural relations. JEE 16 (1947) .101-21.

Warren, W. Lloyd, and Henry, William E. The radio day time serial: a symbolic analysis. GPM 37 (1948) .2-71.

Wilson, Elmo C. The effectiveness of documentary broadcasts. POQ 12 (1948) .19-30.

By the use of panel interviews before and after the listening experiences, CBS attempted to measure the impact of its documentary programs.

6. DEBATE

a. *General: History, Types, Techniques*

Aldrich, Julian C. Developing critical thinking. SE 12 (1948) .115-8.

Baird, A. Craig. How can we improve international debating? QJS 34(1948). 228-30.

Benn, Anthony Wedgwood; Boyle, Sir Edward; and Harris, Kenneth. American and British debating. QJS 34 (1948) .169-72.

A comparison, based upon experiences of the 1947-48 Oxford team in America.

Fest, Thorrel B. A survey of college forensics. QJS 34 (1948) .168-73.

Based upon spring, 1947, activities in 58 colleges.

Hargis, Donald E. A note on championship debaters. QJS 34 (1948) .57-8.

Survey of attitudes toward debate, academic status, etc., of Michigan state championship high school debaters, 1917-1947.

Lloyd, I. S., and Richmond, W. H. L. The 1947 Cambridge Union tour. QJS 34 (1948) .46-9.

An evaluation of American debating from the British debater's viewpoint.

Lull, Paul E. Mass production of debaters. QJS 34 (1948) .374-6.

Place of intramural activity in the total forensics program.

Milner, Major the Rt. Hon. James. The House of Commons from the chair. PA 1 (Winter 1947) .59-66.

The chairmanship function, written by the deputy speaker.

Olson, Donald O. An evaluation of debate. Gavel 30 (1948) .31-4.

Survey of University of Nebraska debaters, 1895-1945, covering present judgments on debating experiences.

Parliamentary privilege in 1947. By a Parliamentary Correspondent. PA 1 (Spring 1948) .9-19.

Analysis of precedent and practice in parliamentary use of questions of privilege.

Phelps, Edith M. Forty years of debate publishing. QJS 34 (1948) .162-7.

The history of the *University debaters' annual* and some trends in debate.

Taylor, Eric. The basis of procedure in the House of Commons. I. PA 1 (Winter 1947) .51-8; II. PA 1 (Spring 1948) . 70-7; III. PA 1 (Summer 1948) .73-84.

This series presents a concise summary of modern procedure in Parliament.

Temple, Norman J., and Dunn, Edward P. British debating is parliamentary. QJS 34 (1948) .50-3.

An estimate by Bates College debaters based upon their 1946 British tour.

7. Discussion

a. *General: History, Types, Techniques*

Anderson, Kurt. A Detroit case study in the group-talking technique. PJ 27 (1948) .93-8.

Does acquaintance with facts (in a labor dispute) lead to skill in handling them?

Back, Kurt. Interpersonal relations in a discussion group. JSI 4 (1948) .61-5.

Behl, William A. The United Nations Security Council. QJS 34 (1948) .40-5.

The effect upon deliberative discussion of the structure and procedure of the Council.

Benne, Kenneth D., and Sheats, Paul. Functional roles of group members. JSI 4 (1948) .41-9.

Brembeck, Winston L., and McLaughlin, Teddy J. A classified bibliography of group discussion. Madison, Wisconsin. Privately published.

An excellent compilation of references on all phases of discussion which brings up to date the bibliographies of Ewbank in QJS 24 (1938) and of the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture (1942). Over 1,000 separate entries are classified under these headings: I. Theory of Group Thought; II. Development and Growth of Discussion; III. Nature, Purposes, Applications and Limitations of Discussion; IV. Types of Discussion (four kinds of private discussion groups, six categories of public discussion groups); V. Leadership in Discussion; VI. Participation in Discussion; VII. Evaluation of Discussion. The volume is mimeographed, and the compilers have wisely left blank spaces in each section of the bibliography for additional entries. (J.J.A.)

Chapin, Leland T. The discussion techniques of the Brookings Institution. QJS 34 (1948) .459-61.

Ewbank, Henry L., and Auer, J. J. Decision making: discussion and debate. BNAP 32 (1948) .34-49.

Halstead, Gordon B. Forums for the people. FFR 3-1 (1948) .5-8.

Appraisal of film forums based upon a series of 75 in 14 different cities.

Hochmuth. See Modern Public Address —Theory.

Jacques, Elliott. Interpretative group discussion as a method of facilitating social change. HR 1 (1948) .533-49.

Jenkins, David H. Feedback and group self-evaluation. JSI 4 (1948) .50-60.

Specialized techniques in discussion.

Knickerbocker, Irving. Leadership: a conception and some implications. JSI 4 (1948) .23-40.

Lasswell, Harold D. The clarifier of public discussion. QJS 34(1948).451-4.

A proposed team-mate for the chairman and spokesman for the audience: his function.

Lippitt, Ronald; Bradford, Leland P.; and Benne, Kenneth D. Sociodramatic clarification of leader and group roles, as a starting point for effective group functioning. Sociatry 1 (1947) .82-91.

McBurney, James H. The role of discussion and debate. Gavel 30 (1948) .64-6.

A sugestion of political and philosophical correlates for each technique.

Maccoby, Eleanor, and Willerman, Ben, eds. Citizen participation in world affairs: problems and possibilities. JSI 4 (1948) .5-6, 21-61.

Includes transcripts of two discussions on practical problems of increasing and organizing local thought and action on foreign affairs.

Miller, Harry L. How the film aids discussion. FFR 3-3 (1948) .3-8.

Norfleet, Bobbie. Interpersonal relations and group productivity. JSI 4 (1948) .66-9.

Schlesser, George E. Organizing community forums. S&S 68 (1948) .113-8.

Report of four-year experience in Hamilton, N. Y.

Sillars, Robertson, ed., Staff of Film Laboratory, Institute for Adult Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. Films for forums on international, economic, child, youth, and health problems: an annotated list. FFR 3-1 (1948) .16-64.

———. Films for adult education: the international scene, the domestic scene: an annotated list. FFR 3-2 (1948) .18-58.

———. Films for adult education: international relations; child care and education; health; political, social, and economic problems: an annotated list. FFR 3-3 (1948) .24-58.

Smith, Janet Adam. Discussion. London. Longmans, for the British Council.

Rev. in TLS (July 31).435.

The review states that 'the author sets out to show the part which the habit of discussion plays in the national life [of Britain] as a means of allowing for the full play of public opinion. The wide range of her survey, illustrated with many characteristic photographs, shows how it fulfills this role in university life, Hyde Park Corner oratory, army discussion groups, Womens Institute meetings, parliamentary debate and many other forms of verbal expression.'

Stearns, Monteagle. Documentary and the discussion film. FFR 3-2 (1948). 2-6.

Criteria and integration for the two types.

Utterback, William E. The moderator's function in group thinking. QJS 34 (1948) .455-8.

b. *Experimental Studies*

Bales, Robert F., and Gerbrands, Henry. The 'interaction recorder,' an apparatus and check list for sequential content analysis of social interaction. HR 1 (1948) .456-63.

Description of construction and use of an instrument for recording observations of content, in sequence, of discussion groups.

Barron, Margaret E., and Krulee, Gilbert K. Case study of a basic skill training group. JSI 4 (1948) .10-30.

Taken from records of National Training Laboratory in Group Development.

Findley, Warren G. A statistical index of participation in discussion. JExP 39 (1948) .47-51.

Horrocks, John E., and Nagy, George. The relationship between the ability to make a diagnosis and to select appropriate remedial procedures. JGP 38 (1948) .139-45.

Malone, Thomas P. Analysis of the dynamics of group psychotherapy based on observations in a twelve-month experimental program. JPer 16 (1948). 245-77.

Rosenthal, David, and Cofer, Charles N. The effect on group performance of an indifferent and neglectful attitude shown by one group member. JExP 38 (1948) .568-77.

Staton, Thomas F. An analysis of the effect of individuals on seminar discussion. AP 7 (1948) .267-8.

Relations between member approved patterns of participation and potency of influence.

OUR TOMORROW

Rupert L. Cortright

I WISH I possessed the skill of an Ingersoll to paint in words the vision of our past as a profession and as a professional association. I see a little group of courageous, far-sighted men breaking away from the National Council of Teachers of English to organize the forerunner of our present SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, thirty-four years ago. During that first year the predecessor of our QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH went to 160 subscribers. Now we print 5500 copies of each issue. Twenty-five years ago there was almost no graduate study in our field. Last year alone 450 advanced degrees were granted in speech by fifty-two institutions.

Since our Silver Anniversary convention here in Washington eight years ago the number of our Substaining Members has more than tripled (1200 now!) and our Association income has nearly doubled. The American Educational Theatre Association has tripled its membership within the last two years. It is estimated that last year in the United States more than half a million plays were produced by non-professionals (that's 1400 a day!); over twenty million sermons were preached; and quite a few political speeches were made—some in vain!

The General Motors organization estimates that 1200 of its employees receive in-service training in speech each year. The Ford Motor Company alone spends ten million dollars annually on its industrial relations program—and a large part of it is communication, discussion, conference and leadership training, *speech!*

Since the end of the war, the number of standard radio stations has doubled (2,000); the number of FM stations has increased thirty times (1,400); the number of television stations twenty times. The number of regular listener-observers of television programs has now reached four million. Since mid-summer people have been buying receiving sets at the rate of upwards of $20,000,000 worth a month!

In the few years since the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA was born have come radio, then the talking picture, now television. Yes, in the past, 20,000 heard Lincoln at Gettysburg, but in our time perhaps forty million heard one of Franklin Roosevelt's fireside chats. A single word increased in instantaneous power of influence 2,000 times! Even such a sketchy vision of our breathless past foretells inevitably tomorrow's decade, which will be—as has no other in history—the *Speaker's Decade.*

But recently there has come to our capital city, in desperate hope, that charming emissary from most distant China—and she made the full journey half way around the world in less time than in early May of 1787 it took George Washington to go from nearby Alexandria only up to Philadelphia for that 'Great Rehearsal.' So has the horizon of our influence expanded and the concern of our tomorrow become as wide

RUPERT L. CORTRIGHT *is Professor of Speech at Wayne University and was President of the SAA during 1948. This address was delivered at the Washington Convention last December.* *The author makes grateful acknowledgment to fifteen Past Presidents of the Association for their helpful suggestions and criticisms during his preparation.*

as is the limit of our vision and our energy.

2

And who are we to take such a happy view of our potentialities, such a heavy view of our responsibilities?

First, we are citizens of the nation which will have more influence than any other upon tomorrow's world. Second, our work is that of teaching those who will make up tomorrow's nation. Third, our field of teaching will better equip each future citizen to make his knowledge and his skill more influential.

Let me first point out that work which we can do as an Association. Then there is work which we must do as individauls. Since 'in today already walks tomorrow,' we have a first obligation in any planning ahead to maintain our present strengths.

The loyalty and essential unity of the members of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA is evidenced by the steadily increasing number of our Sustaining Members. Even, so, while the number of speech teachers must easily have trebled since the war years, our membership has not even nearly doubled. Somehow we must find a way to bring the full cooperative force of a greater majority of all speech teachers into tomorrow's SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

Does this mean that we cannot much longer postpone the decision to establish a permanently located and permanently staffed business office? Does it indicate that a responsibility as important as that of our Executive Secretary cannot much longer be regarded as a sideline, part-time job? If so, this may be the time to begin planning. But our planning needs to be courageous and far-seeing. I have been increasingly impressed by the inefficiencies and costliness of three separate business offices, for instance, for our three Associations: the American Educational Theatre Association, the American Speech and Hearing Association, and the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA. I know the economies of a single combined office could be great—the results for each Association much more advantageous. At first thought you may consider such a suggestion unworkable. I am certain that it is not. I am sure it must eventually be brought about, and there are many in all three organizations who share this view. Short of that goal we must continue to be less efficient and less effective than we ought to be. All other officers except a full-time paid Executive Secretary might be as separate and distinct as now. All of the advantages of separateness would be retained, plus the advantages of more favorable purchasing of supplies in larger quantities, fuller utilization of certain equipment, a more specially trained staff, and the closest cooperation in all business matters.

May this not be the time to set up a study committee which might even be given two years to investigate all phases of this suggestion? I believe the loyalty and concern of all the members of all our associations demand that we somehow provide that kind of forward-looking leadership. Even as radio, talking-picture, and television have revolutionized our recreational lives, so have new equipment and new methods revolutionized the business world. Scholars and teachers may not necessarily be skilled in the arts of business. Just as we expect to be called upon as experts in speech to cope with the speech problems of individuals, so should we ourselves call upon business experts to help us with that phase of our Associations' lives.

I take pride also in the past and present QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH

and covet for it an ever grander future. A distinguished succession of leaders in our field has edited it to its position of high repute among the professional journals. There must ever be a JOURNAL in our future—perhaps someday it may come more often than quarterly. Certainly quality always will be more important than quantity.

I for one earnestly hope we may never make the mistake evident in some of our fellow associations of issuing separate journals for college and secondary and elementary fields. We must keep our thinking straight and our planning strategic. We ought not in one breath complain about the lack of understanding and cooperation between the university and the secondary and elementary levels—then in the next breath propose separate journals to make it more certain that university 'educators' will read even more narrowly, that our communication across all areas of our field may be further hemmed in and restricted.

You tell me you have no time to concern yourself with speech education all the way from kindergarten through the graduate school? Then I say to you: You might well check up on your speech philosophy—perhaps it's out of focus! Nor will I be even slightly intimidated from this position by those who excuse their narrow interests by wrapping about themselves the sainted guise of the intently deep scholar! Even atomic scientists these days seem intent upon *expanding* atoms. So may our JOURNAL never lose awareness of the wide horizons of its service to our whole field from the beginning all the way through the educational process.

Too much cannot be said about the important role of research in contributing to our future. Here, also, we have much in the past for which to be grateful. Since 1934 we have published an annual volume of research in our field—recently two volumes per year. The bringing together in *Monographs* of the complete records of graduate work in speech has constituted a fine service to the profession. That we have now expanded this to include abstracts of theses is an additional service not only to scholars and research experts, but to every teacher who may have the imagination and the vision to see in some thus-discovered bit of research a way to improve his teaching.

In the promotion and encouragement of scholarship and research, there is much more that can be done. Perhaps we may secure research foundation support for broad projects in which many universities can participate. Perhaps through the JOURNAL, or in some other way, we might make it increasingly possible for graduate students to be helpfully in touch with one another's ongoing projects. Also in this area our ASSOCIATION is proud of having brought to publication the two-volume *History and Criticism of American Public Address*—and several other volumes now in process of preparation. These are additional fruits of the cooperative efforts of our united profession.

We may well be proud of our ASSOCIATION'S continuing awareness that the college and university must build upon the product of the secondary and the elementary schools. As early as 1923 we had off the press our ASSOCIATION'S first pronouncement upon the aims, procedures, and course outlines for an entire secondary school speech curriculum. Excellent articles recently have been arranged in such journals as that of the National Education Association and the Bulletin of the Secondary School Principal's Association. There has been the special Elementary School book. And several more are being planned.

The demand for speech training in the schools grows steadily heavier. Yet everywhere there are the besetting obstacles of lack of time in already-crowded curriculums, lack of consideration from accrediting agencies, failure to include speech in college entrance requirements, and its absence from the qualifications for teaching certificates. Somewhere, somehow each of these obstacles has to be overcome. We need to make our counsel in these matters available to state departments of education, to local boards, and to superintendents and principals. The leadership belongs to us. If we neglect this responsibility it will be assumed by others.

Our Placement Service is not of lessened importance during a time when the demand for qualified teachers exceeds the supply. Constantly positions are opening offering magnificent opportunities. Is there anything more tragic than a position of opportunity occupied by a person who lacks the vision, the training, or the ability to make of it what it might be? To place each member in the position where he might do most for himself and for our profession is a proper and important function. It calls for a Placement Service staffed by experts, better equipped to function with speed and efficiency upon a national scale and with trained organization, facilities, and location as nearly permanent as possible.

For the valuable services being rendered by our Executive Vice-President, our gratefulness can hardly be over-stated. The many publications which have devoted special issues to our field, and the influence which we have been able to exert through other associations have been invaluable. These must continue.

3

Now, however, I would not wish to leave the impression that I believe today's dreams may become tomorrow's achievements just through organizations. No association can make up for incompetent scholarship, poor teaching, and undiplomatic leadership. We must, as individuals, measure up to the demands of the times upon us. And we must, first and foremost, do our job. Our job is to teach *speech*. It is quite possible to hear extemporaneous talks, discussions, debates, radio programs, and plays in which certainly the speech part of the communicative process receives minor emphasis. We might even gently question how far our graduate departments should lay the emphasis upon scholarship to the neglect of performance in the arts of speech!

And while we are noting that organization alone is not enough, let us bear in mind that there are limits beyond which it ought not to go. The recent increasing efforts of self-designated groups within the speech field to set themselves up as accrediting agencies can be not only unwarrantably egotistical but positively dangerous. Let us not seek to emulate their arrogance now called in such sharp question by the Association of American Universities.

4

There is a more important point which some of us may be missing in our everyday teaching. President Conant's *Education in a Divided World* discerningly points out that education has failed to keep pace with our rapidly changing country. A writer in the November issue of one of the elementary school journals puts it more vividly: 'The curriculum of today's school is better adapted to the teacher's generation than to the pupil's.'

Think of what has happened within just a few years. I called attention earlier to the increasing speed of our transportation. One effect of this is to throw us constantly into close interpersonal relations with many times the number of people our forefathers met in whole lifetimes. Think of the multiplied opportunities for misunderstandings, for differences, for conflicts, for confusions! Is it any wonder that maladjusted personalities are such a problem, mental and nervous diseases greatly on the increase? Not only are there the serious neuroses and psychoses, but such associated ailments as colitis, arthritis, neuritis, bursitis, 'benign nervousness'! From the recent psychosomatic front, a research assistant at the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center reports: 'Many cases of trench mouth and inflamation of the gums start out as inflamed emotions.' A psychiatrist from Temple University warns: 'Look for emotional troubles in a patient with eczema.'

Almost our only recreations are the super-colossal, emotionally gripping movies, the far from soothing be-bop rhythms, the high pressure I-must-tell-you-this-instant radio programs with their adventure and soap drama episodes leaving the listeners to wring their hands until tomorrow. Even if you set out for a quiet drive in the country to get away from it all, that right foot just unconsciously pushes lower and lower until a gentle voice at the right says: 'Are you in a hurry to get some place? I thought we were going to take a leisurely drive!'

This is my point: Once we talked of speech training in terms of its great valuable contributions to the whole personality. Now have we relinquished that responsibility to psycho-drama and socio-drama only? Woolbert and others of our proud heritage of scholars pointed out long ago that not only is speech the product of the whole organism and thus a most sensitive index of nervous balance or inbalance, but it is one of the best avenues of approach through which to achieve a better balance. Our colleagues in speech correction know this well. Let each of us not forget it. You send a student out of your classroom a better speaker because he is a better-adjusted human being. This is important work for our tomorrow.

I cannot leave this point without emphasizing that it is good for each of us occasionally to reread such basic statements of the philosophy of our field as A. Craig Baird's The Philosophy of the Teacher of Speech, and Andrew T. Weaver's The Case for Speech in our 1938 and 1939 JOURNAL. Speech programs built upon the solid foundation of those pronouncements will be enduring because they are ever adaptable to current needs and to the pupil's generation!

5

Finally, I would lay upon our ASSOCIATION the heavy obligation to be a dual voice for our field: a voice of unity and a voice of strength. Our past presidents were almost unanimous in fixing upon the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA the responsibility to promote a greater sense of solidarity and unity in our field. As one put it: 'We must throw the emphasis upon what we have in common in order to counteract strong centrifugal forces.' Another said: 'We must act against further fragmentation of Speech Departments.' And one, with I think considerable wisdom, suggested that at the university level more reliance upon the democratic process within departmental functioning might help. That is why we must have more democratic functioning within our ASSOCIA-

TION also—and the constitution makes that possible to you at any time. There are several members of the once-famous young Turk rebellion now in reasonably high places who can tell you how if you have any doubts! In unity there *is* strength. In division there is weakness.

You theatre people know well that when theatre is under English it is more often drama than theatre—what your own Kernodle has well-called decadent drama is mere literature rather than drama come-alive upon the theatre stage. When discussion, argument, and debate go elsewhere than in Speech, they are too often but weak shadows of their potentialities. When radio goes elsewhere, when television goes elsewhere, the speech essence of its art is neglected. And so one might go through all the elements of our field.

I make this one generalization without the slightest fear that I may anywhere be refuted either by catalogue evidence or by the evidence of practice: *Where there are separate departments within our one field the students suffer!* That ought not to be. It may also be a little questionable how we may talk with a straight face about the contributions of our field to human harmony and understanding *if* we cannot come to some unity among ourselves. Personally I am much encouraged about our outlook in this respect.

As associations and as a profession, we are reaching maturity—the kind of maturity which one of our distinguished founders, J. M. O'Neill, eloquently pictured at our Silver Anniversary convention. We are holding in increasing respect the welfare of our whole profession and our common broad objectives. We will not let pettiness hold us back from the attainments of our better selves. And we have been petty, we of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, even about choice of convention cities and convention dates. What trivia of difference within which to lose sight of our common destiny! Times like these call for our unified effort.

Consider the challenge of television which must bring theatre and radio together. Even in speech correction we see the significance of television and are already working with the potentialities of drama. The further deterioration of commercial theatre as it has been known in the past and the healthy upsurge of the combined community and educational theatre assure a greater than ever future for this phase of our field.

The demands for adult classes and industrial in-training programs particularly for leadership training, discussion techniques, and development of general expressional ability further emphasize that the demands of tomorrow upon us are too varied and too extensive to be met by us with any but our most united efforts. And this means above all, that we shall sense the breadth of our field and the important contribution of each and every phase to the whole pattern.

6

Just as a university originated as a center—as a place for the in-gathering of learning—so originated our ASSOCIATION. It should be a center, not from which pieces break away for the greater glorification of little egos! Some will learn in time that unless they become parts of movements greater than their own lesser activities, they will never make their maximum contributions either to human learning or to human kind. Our ASSOCIATION should become a center into which the common elements of all our area will flow and from which all of us will derive new and greater strength. Together in harmony and unity, and only together can we be equal to the challenges of tomorrow.

While we are speaking with the voice of unity, we must speak to the nation with a voice of strength. Unless we speak with a voice having authority, the quacks, the uninformed, and the incompetent will. If we shrink back from the responsibilities which these times place upon us, all professions and all men will be the losers, whether we shrink from cowardice, from complacency, or from timidity and deep humility!

There is nothing either brazen or contemptuous about the life guard who plunges in to save a drowning person. And in a world where freedom is drowning, men and women who command speech are needed. Freedom of speech is a mockery to those whose abilities to speak instead of having been developed have been allowed to atrophy. It will be great to be living through tomorrow, greater still to be living in the most influential nation in the world, rarest privilege of all to be a teacher from whose classrooms go the makers of tomorrow.

I am proud and count myself fortunate to be a teacher of speech, guiding to richest possible fruition the highest potentialities of those who ever determine the future. In this age when telephone, talking picture, radio, and television have made the role of speech overwhelmingly transcendent, it will be, indeed, *our* tomorrow.

RESEARCH IN THE HISTORY OF SPEECH EDUCATION

Giles Wilkeson Gray

OUR understanding and appreciation of the whole field of speech are constantly being enlarged and enriched by the contributions of research workers in all phases of our subject. The more than three thousand theses and dissertations listed in SPEECH MONOGRAPHS, together with the innumerable independent studies not made in partial fulfillment of the requirements for advanced degrees, have added immeasurably to the vast body of knowledge which constitutes much of the subject matter of our discipline. This content has achieved a high degree of academic respectability, which, it must be admitted, it has not always been able to maintain.

There have been times when speech education stood at the pinnacle of the educational system; there have been others when it has suffered almost total eclipse. The story of these varying fortunes, of the causes for the changes in status, and of the processes of emergence is a long and interesting one. Hoyt Hudson summed it up for us some years ago.[1] But a more complete examination of the route we have traveled in coming from our beginnings some twenty-four centuries ago to our present position is well worth the undertaking. In the first place, it will give us a still deeper understanding and appreciation of that position, in the same way that any study of history may provide the basis for a better orientation as an aid in determining the direction in which we shall proceed. 'If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending,' said Lincoln, 'we could better judge what to do, and how to do it.' In the second place, the study is in itself peculiarly profitable and satisfying. For those who may not yet have found their particular field of inquiry, I submit the history of speech education as one that is very rich in its possibilities.

GILES WILKESON GRAY *is Professor of Speech at Louisiana State University and Chairman of the Association's Committee on the History of Speech Education.*

[1] Hoyt H. Hudson, The Tradition of Our Subject, QJS 17 (1931).324-9.

I

Let us consider first a relatively limited period, the growth and development of speech education in America, which covers only a little more than three of those twenty-four centuries. What have been the principal philosophies of speech education since the early seventeenth century, and how have those philosophies fitted into the general educational trends? Who have been the chief contributors to those philosophies, and who have been most instrumental in putting them into practice? Under what circumstances and in what localities have the teachers of speech been most active? These are only a few of the multitude of questions which arise when we undertake to explore the history of speech education in America, or elsewhere.

Much work has already been done in this field. Typical of the researches in American speech education which have been completed are Porter Gale Perrin's dissertation on *The Teaching of Rhetoric in America before 1750*,[2] Ota Thomas' and Elaine Pagel Paden's studies on the theory and practice of disputation

[2] Porter Gale Perrin, *The Teaching of Rhetoric in the American Colleges before 1750*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1936.

in six colonial colleges,[3] David Potter's history of debating in nine colonial colleges,[4] Warren Guthrie's *Development of Rhetorical Theory in America, 1635-1850*,[5] Lester L. Hale's analysis of the vocal philosophy of James Rush,[6] Anthony F. Blanks' *Introductory Study in the History of the Teaching of Public Speaking in the United States*,[7] Margaret Robb's *Oral Interpretation of Literature in American Colleges and Universities*,[8] Pearl Bryant's *Speech Re-Education in the Nineteenth Century*,[9] Milton Wiksell's *Social Aspects of Nineteenth Century American Elocution*,[10] Marcelline Erickson's analysis of some one hundred fifty early American school speech texts.[11]

A number of studies have also been made of the rhetorical contributions of earlier teachers and writers: Wilson B. Paul's dissertation on *John Witherspoon's Theory and Practice of Public Speaking*,[12] Horace G. Rahskopf's study of the theory and practice of John Quincy Adams,[13] John P. Hoshor's dissertation on *The Rhetorical Theory of Chauncey Allen Goodrich*,[14] are typical of the nature and quality of work that has been and is being done.

Significant as these and similar studies are, there still remains much to be done before we have a complete picture of the development of speech education in America. There are still, despite the already considerable number of theses, dissertations, and independent researches, too many gaps which need filling. It may be possible to suggest only a few of these needed lines of inquiry.

2

Among the earliest influences on colonial education were the logic of Peter Ramus and the rhetoric of his disciple, Omer Talon, or Audomarus Talaeus. We know that their texts, and others based on their writings, were in wide use during the seventeenth century; but so far no one has made a thorough analysis of their logical and rhetorical theory, particularly in relation to their place in early American speech education.[15] In fact, the impact of the Renaissance as a whole on speech education in America needs to be explored considerably further than has been done.

[3] Ota Thomas, *The Theory and Practice of Disputation at Yale, Harvard, and Dartmouth from 1750 to 1800*, Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1941.

Ruth Elaine Pagel Paden, *The Theory and Practice of Disputation at Princeton, Columbia, and the University of Pennsylvania from 1750 to 1800*, Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1943.

[4] David Potter, *Debating in the Colonial Chartered Colleges: an Historical Survey, 1642 to 1900* (New York, 1944).

[5] Warren Guthrie, *The Development of Rhetorical Theory in America 1635-1850*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1940. See also *Speech Monographs*, 13 (1946).14-22; 14 (1947).38-54; 15 (1948).61-71.

[6] Lester L. Hale, *A Re-Evaluation of the Vocal Philosophy of James Rush as Based on a Study of His Sources*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1942.

[7] Anthony F. Blanks, *An Introductory Study in the History of the Teaching of Public Speaking in the United States*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1927.

[8] Mary Margaret Robb, *The Oral Interpretation of Literature in American Colleges and Universities* (New York, 1941).

[9] Pearl Bryant, *Speech Re-Education in the Nineteenth Century*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1941.

[10] Milton Joel Wiksell, *Social Aspects of Nineteenth Century American Elocution*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1948.

[11] Marcelline Erickson, *Speech Training in the Common Schools, Academies, and High Schools of the United States from 1785 to 1885 as Revealed by a Study of the Books Used in the Schools*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1948.

[12] Wilson B. Paul, *John Witherspoon's Theory and Practice of Public Speaking*, Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1940.

[13] Horace G. Rahskopf, *John Quincy Adams' Theory and Practice of Public Speaking*, Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1933. See also *Archives of Speech* 1, 4 (1936).7-98.

[14] John P. Hoshor, *The Rhetorical Theory of Chauncey Allen Goodrich*, Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1947. See also *Speech Monographs* 14 (1947).1-37.

[15] See in this connection Nelson E. Norman, Peter Ramus and the Confusion of Logic, Rhetoric, and Poetry. *University of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology*, No. 2 (Ann Arbor, 1947).

The growth of English elocution from 1750 to 1850 has been traced,[16] and Margaret Robb has written somewhat of its influence on American speech education; but it is highly probable that there still remains much material as yet uncovered. What, for example, was the influence of the Reverend Gilbert Austin and his *Chironomia* on American writers and teachers? Andrew Comstock used much of his material; how widespread were his theories?

The early nineteenth century seems to have been a time of great activity in American speech education. Yarbrough has studied the homiletic theory and practice of Ebenezer Porter;[17] but Porter also contributed greatly to the elocutionary theory of his time, writing a number of books on the subject. His contribution and its impact on the educational practices of the times should be analyzed. What were his sources, and to what extent did he deviate from them? What was Porter's position in the general education of his day, and how were his elocutionary teachings generally received by early nineteenth century educators?

It may be said that James Rush in 1827 provided the basis for the first indigenous American speech theory. His basic philosophy of the human voice has been analyzed with considerable acumen;[18] but his influence on the teaching of elocution, which extended over a period of a century or more, has not as yet been adequately traced. One of his ardent followers was Jonathan Barber, a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, who seems to have made the first attempt, in 1830,[19] to apply Rush's philosophy in practical teaching. Barber taught at both Harvard and Yale, one of his students at Harvard being Wendell Phillips. A study of Jonathan Barber, as well as of the other five men who, Rush said himself, had done most to spread his teaching, should certainly be made.

When Rush listed these six men, James E. Murdoch apparently either had not yet begun his studies with Rush or was too young to have made much of an impression on his teacher. Yet it was Murdoch probably more than any of Rush's other students who formed the direct link between Rush and the present generation; for Murdoch, the student of Rush, was in turn the teacher of T. C. Trueblood. The life and work of Murdoch, covering some sixty or more years of activity as teacher, reader, and actor, extended from shortly after the appearance of Rush's first edition to the establishment of the department at the University of Michigan in 1892, and beyond. He is too important a person in the history of speech education to be neglected.

Collaborating with Murdoch in 1845 in the writing of the *Orthophony*,[20] which was revised as late as 1882, was William Russell, apparently a prominent educator of the mid-nineteenth century. With one John Goldsbury, Russell had the previous year published *The American School Reader*,[21] which contained much of Rush's theory. How did it come about that Russell and Murdoch came together to write one of the most widely used texts of the century, and, in the early forties to establish their school of elocution and gymnastics? (The fate of

[16] Frederick W. Haberman, *The Elocutionary Movement in England, 1750-1850*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University, 1947.

[17] Robert Clyde Yarbrough, *The Homiletical Theory and Practice of Ebenezer Porter*, Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1942.

[18] Lester L. Hale, op. cit.

[19] Jonathan Barber, *A Grammar of Elocution* (New Haven, 1830).

[20] James E. Murdoch and William Russell, *Orthophony, or Vocal Culture* (Boston, 1845).

[21] John Goldsbury and William Russell, *The American School Reader* (Boston, 1844).

this school is well known—it was so successful that it failed!) The whole story of this movement needs telling.

Warfel[22] has written of the great lexicographer, Noah Webster; but the influence of lexicography on the speech of America has yet to be studied with any degree of definiteness. It seems quite certain that the pronouncing dictionaries, especially that of Webster and to a lesser degree that of Worcester, could not but have made a profound and lasting impress on the speech of the people. In fact, the whole movement including the dictionaries, the analysis of sounds, the phonetic studies, all contributed in no small degree to the improvement of speech in this country. The scientific work of the Bells—Alevander Melville and his son, Alexander Graham—is a distinct addition to our understanding of the processes of speech production. It has not as yet been properly evaluated.

A study of Noah Webster's son-in-law, Chauncey Allen Goodrich, has recently been made; it has already been referred to. Probably less is known of a contemporary and colleague of Goodrich, 'an eccentric old gentleman by the name of North.' This was Erasmus Darwin North, M.D., who was also teaching at Yale in the forties and fifties, and who in 1846 published his *Practical Speaking as Taught in Yale College*.[23] Sometime between 1852 and 1856 Dr. North had in his class a young student who was destined to become a United States senator, railroad executive, and one of the most popular after-dinner speakers of his day —Chauncey M. Depew. It was to Dr. North's teaching that Depew attributed his ability to be heard even in the largest auditoriums, and that was before the advent of microphones and loud speakers.

[22] Harry R. Warfel, *Noah Webster, Schoolmaster to America* (New York, 1936).

[23] E. D. North, M.D., *Practical Speaking as Taught in Yale College* (New Haven, 1846).

Just who was North? What was his background, the source of his teachings, which even today, after more than a hundred years, reveal in many respects a surprising modernity?

The nineteenth century produced scores, even hundreds, of teachers, a few of great merit, many mediocre, and a great number definitely inferior. They include the itinerants, some of whom, like Fulton and the Truebloods, finally took root and succeeded in building up departments with high academic standing. The teaching of speech in the separate colleges of America is in itself a story that cries for study. There is, for example, the story of the pioneer who traveled from college to college in central New York State, organizing the work of teaching speech—and later with a partner migrated into the West to establish the Wells-Fargo Express Company. The development of speech activities within our separate academies, colleges, and universities needs examining, for if we will but look about us we shall find, many of us, that within our own institutions is a rich history of speech education.

One writer reports, for example, that she finds so much material at Bowdoin College that it is impossible to use all of it. A similar study now in progress at Louisiana State University reveals that from the earliest years of the school rhetoric, declamation, and oratory were integral parts of the curriculum. It may well be that parallel studies for most of the colleges and universities will reveal equally interesting, even fascinating histories. Of the nine colonial chartered colleges discussed in Potter's history of debating, not one has an adequate history of its speech activities. Some of the studies that have already been made cover only one aspect of the whole subject, although others include the whole scope

of speech education within the respective institutions: Margot Truman's *History of Speech Education in the University of South Dakota, 1892-1942*,[24] and Gordon John Klopf's *History of Speech Training at the University of Wisconsin*[25] are typical of the more complete studies, while Lowery LeRoy Cowperthwaite's *History of Intercollegiate Forensics at the State University of Iowa*,[26] Phillip Nathaniel Walker's *History of Dramatic Activities at the University of Washington from the Beginning to June 1919*,[27] and William Gibson Butt's *History of Dramatic Activities at Michigan State College to 1937*[28] are representative of studies of the more limited type that have been made in recent years.

Much has been made of the 'first' department at the University of Michigan, established in 1892. Yet as early as 1873 a School of Speech was inaugurated at Boston University under the deanship of Lewis B. Monroe, who had earlier introduced speech training into the public schools of Boston. Unfortunately, the school lasted only four years. But the catalog of the University of Mississippi for 1886 lists a Department of Elocution; and in the year 1884 a department of rhetoric and oratory was authorized and organized at DePauw University—a department that has never lost its autonomy. Hamilton College appears to have recognized a department as early as 1841. The whole question of the establishment of 'departments' needs examination. When Goodrich and North taught at Yale, or when John Quincy Adams or Edward Channing taught at Harvard, were there 'departments?' When did the process begin? What was its course, and where does speech education fit into the whole scheme of departmental organization? The administrative aspects of the teaching of speech should be thoroughly explored. There is not a sufficient treatment of this question even in Herbert Rahe's excellent *History of Speech Education in Ten Indiana Colleges*.[29]

Very few of the teachers of speech of the middle and late nineteenth century have been given the attention they deserve, although a few studies have been made. Lucille Mary Current's *Study of Solomon Henry Clark as a Teacher of Interpretative Speech*,[30] Helen K. Phillips' study of *The Influence of Samuel Silas Curry on Modern Interpretation Textbooks*,[31] Anne Christine Drake's report on *The Elocutionary Theories of S. S. Curry and Their Application*,[32] and Gail Jordan Tousey's analysis of *The Elocutionary Teachings of William Holmes McGuffey*[33] are all typical of the sort of investigation of which more should be made.

But there are many other outstanding teachers who made their impact on

[24] Margot Truman, *The History of Speech Education in the University of South Dakota*, M.A. Thesis, University of South Dakota, 1947.

[25] Gordon John Klopf, *The History of Speech Training at the University of Wisconsin*, M.A. Thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1941.

[26] Lowery LeRoy Cowperthwaite, *The History of Intercollegiate Forensics at the State University of Iowa*, M.A. Thesis, State University of Iowa, 1946.

[27] Phillip Nathaniel Walker, *The History of Dramatic Activities at the University of Washington from the Beginning to June, 1919*, M.A. Thesis, University of Washington, 1947.

[28] William Gibson Butt, *The History of Dramatic Activities at Michigan State College to 1937*, M.A. Thesis, Michigan State College, 1947.

[29] Herbert Edgar Rahe, *The History of Speech Education in Ten Indiana Colleges*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1939.

[30] Lucille Mary Current, *A Study of Solomon Henry Clark as a Teacher of Interpretative Speech*, M.A. Thesis, Northwestern University 1938.

[31] Helen K. Phillips, *The Influence of Samuel Silas Curry on Modern Interpretation Textbooks*, M.A. Thesis, University of Alabama, 1942.

[32] Anne Christine Drake, *The Elocutionary Theories of S. S. Curry and Their Application*, M.A. Thesis, Louisiana State University, 1943.

[33] Gail Jordan Tousey, *The Elocutionary Teachings of William Holmes McGuffey*, M.A. Thesis, Louisiana State University, 1946.

speech education, but who, from available information, have not as yet been studied adequately, if at all. They include such men as Henry N. Day, Henry Mandeville, Anson J. Upson, Henry A. Frink, Lewis B. Monroe, J. W. Shoemaker, John Silvernail, Charles Haddock, W. B. Chamberlain, Arthur E. Phillips, Leland Powers, Duncan Campbell Lee, James A. Winans, Edwin DuBois Shurter, Erastus L. Palmer, Daniel W. Redmond, both T. C. and E. P. Trueblood, to mention only a few at random. Any of these might be a fitting subject for intensive inquiry. Living today are still a number of pioneers in our field, the study of whose contributions would be not only highly informative but inspirational as well.

The development of professional organizations in our discipline is still another possible subject of inquiry. We are inclined to look upon the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, which dates its founding only as late as thirty-five years ago, as the pioneer professional organization in speech. Yet, as John T. Marshman[34] pointed out some years ago, there were professional associations preceding our own. The full history of these organizations is yet to be written. There was, for example, the old National Elocutionists' Association, established in 1892, which continued in existence until after the founding of our own National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking in 1914. (How many recognize this title as the original designation of our present Speech Association in America?). Why, incidentally, when the name was selected, was the emphasis placed on the *academic* teachers? Why could not the seventeen founders of the NAATPS have worked through the already established organization of elocutionists, which was at the time more than twenty years old? T. C. Trueblood thinks that they could and should have; but J. S. Gaylord, one of the seventeen, insists that it would have been impossible.[35] What philosophies of speech education were at work which impelled the founders not only to pull out of the National Council of Teachers of English, but also to repudiate an organization already established in the field of speech? Why was it that shortly after the new association was founded the old one faded out and finally disbanded? What did the new organization have to offer that the older one lacked? Wherein lay its strength and vitality?

There are other professional organizations still functioning strongly, and if our information is correct, they are older than the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA: The Eastern Public Speaking Conference and the Texas Speech Arts Association, for example. The story of the Texas Interscholastic League, which E. D. Shurter was instrumental in establishing, has at least partially been written;[36] but what of the numerous other state declamatory, forensic, and oratorical leagues all over the country? There are equally significant stories in the literary and debating societies that sprang up in the colleges and universities, and flourished for generations. One study of the literary societies in four southern universities is now in progress;[37] There should be many others.

It is obviously out of the question to suggest all the possible approaches to a complete history of speech education in

[34] John T. Marshman, An Appraisal, QJS 20 (1936).302-5.

[35] Personal interviews, at Bradenton and St. Petersburg, Florida, March 1941.

[36] Rex Paxton Kyker, *A History and Evaluation of the Forensic Division of the University Interscholastic League of Texas*, M.A. Thesis, State University of Iowa, 1946.

[37] Frank Davis, *The Literary Societies at the Universities of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Louisiana State University, in progress.

America; I have done no more than to hint at some of the potentialities in this area. If we are to have a complete account of the backgrounds of American speech education, if ever a genuine history of speech education in this country is to be written, these studies will have to be made.

Thus far the discussion has been limited to the American scene. It is of course well known that speech education did not begin in America. The disputations of Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, Kings College, Princeton, and the University of Pennsylvania—the early forerunners of the type of debating that engaged the energies of students in all the colonial colleges—were patterned after similar exercises which had been going on in the universities of England and Europe for centuries. What was their relation to the *suasoriae* and the *controversiae* of the Roman Empire? Much of the ancient, medieval, and renaissance history of speech education we already know; but much more of it has not yet been brought together in such a way as to give us a complete picture of speech education from antiquity up through the centuries to its beginnings in America, and through the next three centuries in Europe.

3

Probably the greatest teacher of the Second Sophistic, for example, and holding a position comparable to that of Isocrates in the First, was one Libanius of Antioch. Though a devout pagan himself, his school drew many of the Fathers of the Church during the fourth century A.D.: Basil, Gregory, and the 'silver-tongued' John Chrysostom among them. The story is told that Libanius deeply resented the advancement of Christianity; in his last days he was asked whom he wished to succeed him in his 'chair' of rhetoric. 'John Chrysostom,' he replied, 'if the Christians haven't got him.' Libanius left an enormous collection of letters and orations in which he expounded his rhetorical and pedagogical theories. These principles should be analyzed, assembled, and made available to present day teachers of speech. In 1922 the Loeb Classical Library announced an edition of Libanius 'in preparation,' but apparently the project has since been dropped entirely from the lists of volumes either published or in preparation.

The three important Greek rhetorical treatises of the period—those of Theon, Hermogenes, and Aphthonius—yet remain to be done into English. It was the *Progymnasmata* of Aphthonius which provided the prinicpal textbook in rhetoric for some twelve hundred years, from the fourth to the sixteenth centuries. Several Latin translations were made, that of Lorich being the most popular. In 1563 it was adapted, not translated, into English by Richard Rainolde, in his *Foundacion of Rhetorike*.[38]

The Reverend Gilbert Austin and his *Chironomia* have been mentioned. In the writing of this work Austin drew upon many Latin, Greek and French sources: Cassiodorus, Caussinus *(De eloquentia sacra et profana)*, Fortunatianus; among his French sources were Dubos, Dubroca, Fenelon, Condillac, Lavater. Very frequently he refefred to the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. It would be worth while to trace these sources. It should be mentioned that many of us are eagerly awaiting the edition of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* which Professor Caplan is preparing for the Loeb Classical Library. If there are available editions of all those mentioned by Austin, it has not been my fortune to discover them.[39]

[38] Richard Rainolde, *The Foundacion of Rhetorike* (London, 1563).

[39] Lavater's *Physiognomy* is one of the few that are available.

We have excellent studies of Thomas Wilson,[40] Francis Bacon,[41] Richard Whately,[42] and George Campbell;[43] Schmitz has given a good treatment of Hugh Blair.[44] Sandford has given us a survey of English theories of public address from 1530 to 1828,[45] Harding a more detailed study of the latter half of the eighteenth century.[46] Howell's edition of the *Rhetoric of Alcuin and Charlemagne*[47] is a scholarly contribution to our knowledge of the rhetorical teaching of the eighth century. Hultzén has given us a translation of Charles Butler's treatment of memory.[48] A complete edition of Butler's *Rhetoricae libri duo* as well as of his *Oratoriae libri duo* would be of no little interest. And what of Sir John Cheke, John Hart, Alexander Gill, Bishop Wilkins, and still others?

The Renaissance gave us a number of men who were actively interested in education, including rhetorical instruction. Among these may be included Vives, Melancthon, Erasmus and others. Peter Ramus and Audomarus Talaeus have already been mentioned.

A study of Sir Joshua Steele *(Prosodia Rationalis)* and his influence is now in progress,[49] but neither Thomas Sheridan nor John Walker of the late eighteenth century has ever been separately studied, although both have been included in broader investigations of the period in which they flourished. Both wrote and lectured on elocution; both published dictionaries; both were highly influential in England and in America. One, according to general understanding, advanced the 'natural' school,[50] the other the 'mechanical' school. Winans' analysis of the two, particularly in relation to Whately, is penetrating so far as it goes; but we need a more exhaustive examination of the speech theory of both writers.

The late eighteenth century also represents the great period of British oratory. What was the nature of the speech instruction of the outstanding English parliamentary speakers—the Pitts, Burke, Fox, Sheridan, and all the others? Were they familiar with Ward's *System of Oratory*, or with Lawson, or with the classical treatises of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian?

4

But why continue? It would be futile to attempt to point out all the questions that arise when we undertake to trace in any detail the road over which the teaching of speech has traveled in twenty-four hundred years. One can hardly mention a period which has been exhausted. It is impossible to suggest all the areas in which research is needed; perhaps I have been able to indicate a few of them. The field is wide open for any zealous investigator who may be or who may become interested in knowing just a little more about where we came from and how we got to where we are.

[40] Russell H. Wagner, *Thomas Wilson's Arte of Rhetorique*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University, 1928.

[41] Karl R. Wallace, *Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric, or The Art of Applying Reason to Imagination* (Chapel Hill, 1943).

[42] W. M. Parrish, *Richard Whately's Elements of Rhetoric, Parts I and II: A Critical Edition*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University, 1928.

[43] Clarence William Edney, *George Campbell's Theory of Public Address*, Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1946.

John Woodford Crawford, *The Rhetoric of George Campbell*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1947.

[44] Robert M. Schmitz, *Hugh Blair* (New York, 1948).

[45] William P. Sandford, *English Theories of Public Address, 1530-1828*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1929 (Columbus, Ohio, 1938).

[46] Harold F. Harding, *English Rhetorical Theory, 1750-1800*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University, 1937.

[47] Wilbur Samuel Howell, *The Rhetoric of Alcuin and Charlemagne* (Princeton, 1941).

[48] Lee S. Hultzén, Charles Butler on Memory, *Speech Monographs* 6 (1939).44-65.

[49] John B. Newman, *The Influence of Sir Joshua Steele*, Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, in progress.

[50] James Albert Winans, Whately on Elocution, QJS 31 (1945).1-8.

SOME PLATONIC INFLUENCES IN THE RHETORICAL WORKS OF CICERO

William M. Sattler

IN his last strictly rhetorical treatise Cicero says: 'I confess that whatever ability I possess as an orator comes, not from the workshops of the rhetoricians, but from the spacious grounds of the Academy.'[1] The unequivocal eulogy of the Platonic Academy which Cicero here expresses may be considered as an hypothesis subject to examination. The object of this study is to discover in what respects, and to what degree, Cicero's testimony in the *Orator* can be accepted.

It is certainly fair to say that the statement above exaggerates the influence of the Academy upon Cicero's rhetoric and oratory, and undervalues that of his non-Academic rhetorical and philosophical training. Moreover, in this instance Cicero fails to give recognition to other significant sources from which he fashioned considerable portions of his theory of rhetoric. These sources, exclusive of Cicero's independent instruction in law and rhetoric, are at least three: 1. the writings of Aristotle and Theophrastus and the practices of the Peripatetic school,[2] 2. the teachings of the Stoic philosophers in the fields of rhetoric, dialectic, and ethics,[3] and 3. the educational and rhetorical principles of Isocrates and the Isocratean tradition.[4]

When Cicero indicates that eloquence issues directly from the Academy, he is thinking primarily of the program of studies and tenets of the Academy of his time, namely, the New Academy. This is not to say that Cicero fails to honor Plato's first school, but rather that the New Academy is Cicero's conception of a proper interpretation of the Platonic tradition. It is therefore important to consider the problem of the influence of Plato from two points of view: 1. the direction which Cicero's thought takes under the influence of the Middle and New Academy as distinguished from the original Academy, and 2. the materials which Cicero takes directly from the dialogues of Plato.

1

Plato's distrust of a rhetoric of persuasion is well known.[5] In addition to the dialogues which are largely concerned with a critique of rhetoric, Platonic opposition to persuasion is evident in those passages in the *Republic*, Bk. VII, which deal with the curricular studies. Here Plato suggests, as he elsewhere explicitly states, that rhetoric is a form of knowledge which must be classified as *ignorance* or *opinion*. Rhetoric is thus distinguished from disci-

WILLIAM M. SATTLER *is Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Michigan.*

[1] *Orator*, trans. H. M. Hubbell (London, 1939), 3. 12; also Otto Jahn and Wilhelm Kroll, *M. Tullii Ciceronis Orator* (Berlin, 1913) 11-12.

[2] Friedrich Solmsen, The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric, *American Journal of Philology*, 62 (January 1941 and April 1941); also, Aristotle and Cicero on the Orator's Playing upon the Feelings, *Classical Philology*, 33 (October 1938).

[3] George Thiele, *Hermagoras: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Rhetorik* (Strassburg, 1893).

[4] Russell H. Wagner, The Rhetorical Theory of Isocrates, QJS 8 (1922).323-34; also Harry M. Hubbell, The Influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius and Aristides, *Classical Weekly* 9 (1915).79.

[5] Everett Lee Hunt, Plato and Aristotle on Rhetoric and Rhetoricians, *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James A. Winans* (New York, 1925) 3-60.

plines designed to produce *philosophic* knowledge. With this point in mind, as well as the Platonic arguments against sophists and rhetoricians, one is hardly prepared to discover that rhetoric was later accepted as a part of the curriculum in the Academy.

Philo of Larissa, who was president of the Academy during Cicero's youth, formally introduced rhetorical instruction in his school. Philo visited Rome in 88 B.C. and Cicero indicates that he followed the lectures of Philo with much enthusiasm.[6] 'Philo, as we remember, for we often heard him lecture, made a practice of teaching the rules of the rhetorician at one time, and those of the philosophers at another.'[7] It will be recalled in this connection that the union of philosophy and eloquence is one of Cicero's favorite doctrines. In the *Tusculan Disputations* Cicero himself follows the method of Philo: 'Accordingly, after spending the morning in rhetorical exercises, we went in the afternoon, as on the day before, down to the Academy, and there a [philosophical] discussion took place.'[8]

The action of Philo and his New Academy in teaching both rhetoric and philosophy appears to be the result of the influence of the system of logic and dialectical practices of the Middle Academy. Under Arcesilaus (*c.* 315-240 B.C.) and Carneades (*c.* 213-129 B.C.) the Academy adopted a philosophy of skepticism. This in turn, as will be indicated shortly, led to a logic of probabilities which was suited to the purposes of rhetoric.

An explanation of the change of emphasis in the Academy can be discovered in the writings of Cicero. The reports of Cicero, our best and most complete authority in this matter, show that Arcesilaus abstracted from the Platonic dialogues those passages which emphasize the fallibility of mental and sensory judgment.[9] With these passages as his evidence, Arcesilaus framed his arguments in refutation of the Stoic tenet that the syllogism was an instrument for attaining certainty or truth.[10] He argued, for example, that arguments of equal validity could be marshalled *for* and *against* any statement. The broad skeptical view of Arcesilaus was modified by Carneades to mean that if arguments on a given problem were weighed, a balance of probability could be reached. He distinguished degrees of probability which were used by the Academy to carry on further opposition to the Stoic dogma that every proposition is either true or false.[11]

The two Middle Academy philosophers were both competent theorists in the principles of dialectical reasoning and also persuasive and skillful in public address. Cicero repeatedly refers to the rhetorical proficiency of these leaders of the Academy, particularly of Carneades, and makes a special point of the fact that they are famous for eloquence as well as philosophy.[12] 'Even the rhetoricians,' says Diogenes Laertius, 'would dismiss their classes and repair to Carneades to hear him lecture.'[13]

The theory of knowledge advanced by the Middle and New Academy is of course only a partial representation of

[6] *Brutus*, trans. G. L. Hendrickson (London, 1939) 89; also *De Oratore*, trans. E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham (London, 1942) iii. 28. 110.

[7] *Tusculan Disputations*, trans. J. E. King (London, 1927) ii. 3. 9.

[8] Ibid. ii. 3. 10; see also Wilhelm Kroll, *Die Kultur der Ciceronischen Zeit* (Leipzig, 1933) II, 133.

[9] *De Oratore* iii. 18. 67.

[10] *Posterior Academics*, trans. J. S. Reid (London, 1880) i. 14; also Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, trans. R. D. Hicks (London, 1925) iv. 6. 28.

[11] *De Fato*, trans. H. Rackham (London, 1942) 16. 38; also Diogenes Laertius, iv. 9. 62.

[12] *De Oratore*, i. 11. 47; ii. 39. 161; iii. 18. 68; iii. 21. 80; also *Orator*, 16. 51.

[13] Diogenes Laertius, iv. 9. 63.

Platonic doctrines. The point is, however, that the leaders of these schools, and Cicero as a member of the New Academy, argued that a logic of probabilities more nearly reflected Plato's views than did the dogmatic certitude of the Stoics. Cicero was much impressed with the Platonic dialogues of investigation in which Socrates shows hesitancy in reaching any given conclusion. Furthermore, Plato makes no claim for blind consistency: thus he argues against *probability* in the *Gorgias* but *nevertheless* gives his plan of *resemblances* (resemblance to the truth) in the *Phaedrus*. 'With Plato,' says Lane Cooper, 'it is safer to look for system in the individual work.'[14] In this regard Paul Shorey states: 'Plato's very fairness of mind and literary cleverness could be used to prove him a skeptic . . . he states the case of the doctrine he repudiates so plausibly as to disconcert his own adherents.'[15] Finally, it should be noted that in the *Phaedrus*, 263, Plato directly assigns the word *doubtful* to the class of subject matter with which rhetoric deals, distinguishing the rhetorical from subjects about which men do not *waver*. While this theory of knowledge is generally perpetuated by Cicero, as it is to even a greater extent by Aristotle also, Cicero fails clearly to identify the Aristotelian enthymeme as the instrument of rhetorical proof.[16] His doctrine of the probable nature of conclusions stems more directly from the indecision of Socrates and the skepticism of Arcesilaus and Carneades, and, of course, from Greek rhetorical tradition as well.

It is of more than passing interest to note that the principle of probability of the New Academy is expressed in all the rhetorical works of Cicero. Even in the *De Inventione* which reflects Stoic influence, Cicero shows that tentative conclusions rather than dogmatic pronouncements are characteristic of his school. Thus he reports that he is willing to change his mind when he is taught better;[17] again, in the *Orator* he says: 'I have never found anything more substantial to hold to or use in forming my opinions than what seemed most like the truth.'[18]

The latter observation which is made in the closing section of the *Orator* possibly suggests Plato's principle of *resemblances to the truth* as expressed in the *Phaedrus*. Apart from a few highly suspect references concerning a correlation between *probable conclusions* and the worldly copy of *essential truth*, the Platonic theory of Ideas is not utilized in Cicero's system of logical proof. Cicero was accustomed to weigh evidence on the basis of likelihood of occurrence, and in such matters was not disposed to ponder the unchanging truths of Plato.

It is clear that the skeptical elements of the Platonic dialogues as reflected in the teachings of the above mentioned Academies exerted a positive influence on Cicero's writings. The dictum of the New Academy that certainty was not within the reach of man was well suited to the demands of oratory. The Academy is thus advanced by Cicero as an authority in support of the presumptive proofs of rhetoric.

2

Cicero also makes many direct references to the dialogues of Plato which are largely independent of the influence of the Middle and New Academy. In his writings, rhetorical and philosophical,

[14] Lane Cooper, *Plato* (Oxford, 1938) xix.
[15] Paul Shorey, *Platonism, Ancient and Modern* (Berkeley, 1938) 11.
[16] James H. McBurney, The Place of the Enthymeme in Rhetorical Theory, *Speech Monographs*, 3 (1936).68.
[17] *De Inventione*, trans. C. D. Yonge (London, 1879) ii. 3.
[18] *Orator*, 71 .238.

he shows that he is familiar with more than ten of the Platonic dialogues,[19] including, of course, the *Gorgias* and *Phaedrus*.[20]

While it is here impossible, and perhaps unfruitful, to document all Platonic references in the rhetorical works of Cicero, it is believed that the materials which follow are nevertheless both reasonably complete and of primary rhetorical interest.

1. The dialogue form which is so often used by ancient writers as a substitute for strictly expository writing is followed by Cicero in the *Brutus* and *De Oratore* as well as in many of the philosophical compilations. The guidance offered by Plato in this matter has usually been recognized as of considerable importance. In the writings of Cicero there are many instances (see *De Oratore*, i. 7. 28) in which he tells us that he wishes to imitate Socratic dialectic. But the fact is that Cicero's dialogues are modeled after Aristotle's exoteric works. *In Ad Familiares* i. 9, Cicero states that the *De Oratore* was an attempt to emulate the dialogue pattern of Aristotle; again, in *Ad Atticum* xiii. 19, much the same point of view is expressed. Based upon Cicero's reports and the fragments of the Aristotelian dialogues which remain,[21] the Aristotelian scientific discussion dispenses with the conversational give and take of the typical Platonic dialogues. Moreover, Cicero describes the Aristotelian dialogue as one in which 'the conversation is so put forward as to leave him [Aristotle] the principal part' (*Ad Atticum*, xiii. 19). Cicero follows this practice in most of his dialogues, although in the *De Oratore* the assumed historical setting requires the use of characters other than himself.

2. Cicero in the *Orator* argues that the Platonic theory of Ideas has a significant relationship to rhetoric (see 7; 10; 100; 237). Here he associates the universal truths of Plato with his doctrine of the perfect or ideal orator. The Platonic transcendental universals, which incidentally were repudiated by Aristotle and Plato's immediate successors alike, are transformed by Cicero to mean simply a variable ideal. Although Cicero indicates that Platonic *Forms* are eternal and unchanging, he concludes the *Orator* by saying that conceptions of the perfect orator might differ. He says, for example, that Brutus might have opinions different from his own and that even his personal conception of perfection might change.[22] In Cicero's earlier rhetorical works the correlation between perfect eloquence and the Platonic *Idea* is not clearly drawn, although some probable references to this conception are discernible in the *De Oratore* (see iii. 16; 21; 85).

3. By insisting upon the learning offered through philosophy (logic, physics, ethics), Cicero frees rhetoric at least in part from the Platonic charge that the rhetorician is deficient in *wisdom*. He consistently recommends studies in dialectics, ethics, and at times, natural philosophy. Although Cicero was highly skeptical of natural philosophy, he mentions the point made by Plato in the *Phaedrus*, 270, that Pericles was an effective speaker because he studied under Anaxagoras (see *De Oratore*, iii. 138; *Orator*, 4. 15; *Brutus*, 10. 44). While it is well known that Cicero emphasizes training in all areas of knowledge in his later writings, little or no thought is

[19] See for example J. E. Sandys, Cicero's *Orator* (Cambridge, 1885) 12.

[20] See especially, *De Oratore*, i. 11. 47; *Orator*, 13. 41.

[21] Werner Jaeger, *Aristotle, Fundamentals of His Development*, trans. R. Robinson (Oxford, 1934) 28.

[22] Cicero translated the *Timaeus* in 45 B.C. It is believed that this Platonic work prompted Cicero to give exemplification to the theory of Ideas.

given to the matter in his earliest rhetorical treatise. We find however that this same doctrine is also present, with less emphasis to be sure, in the opening chapters of the first book of the *De Inventione*.[23]

4. The union of philosophy and eloquence is of course the Ciceronian ideal. Cicero directly quotes from the *Phaedrus*, 279, the language Plato used in praise of Isocrates (*Orator*, 13. 42). Perhaps it should be added that Plato's words in this passage permit of more than one interpretation and that he also expresses a contradictory position. In the *Euthydemus*, 304-5, for example, he refers to *philosopher-politicians*, and this reference may well be to Isocrates, as being deficient in both of these fields of endeavor. The fact nevertheless remains that Cicero literally interprets the commendation given by Plato in the *Phaedrus* to support the union of the philosopher, statesman, and orator; or in other words, the Isocratean ideal of education.

5. In Cicero's later works he makes some statements concerning the divisions of the speech which suggest that he is taking into account the Platonic critique. Plato in *Phaedrus*, 266, speaks disparagingly of the divisions of the speech as mere *niceties* of the art of rhetoric.[24] The *De Inventione* makes use of the divisions of the speech as a frame of reference almost exclusively, and we can therefore be certain that Cicero was well schooled in the rhetoric which places primary attention upon matters of arrangement. The position of Cicero in the *De Oratore* is modified: here he says that 'prefaces, perorations and similar trumpery' are secondary in importance to the philosophical learning of the orator (i. 86; i. 143; iii. 122). In other words Cicero shows the inadequacy of rhetorical instruction narrowly conceived in the sense of formal rules of arrangement. It is hazardous to say that Cicero's attitude regarding the divisions of the speech is the direct result of his reading of the *Phaedrus*. The remarks of Aristotle on this point and the Peripatetic tradition are probably of greater importance. But since it is quite certain that Cicero was aware of Plato's opposition to the formal rules of rhetoric, it is probable that this knowledge had some bearing upon the statements made in the *De Oratore*.

Among the materials reported in this section, the theory of Ideas is obviously a direct Platonic influence. In other matters, however, the Platonic writings may not always be the dominant force which prompted Cicero to develop a given point of view. But it is nevertheless apparent that Cicero makes use of the testimony of Plato whenever possible to confirm a doctrine or a principle of rhetoric.

3

In a negative, although still in a direct, sense the writings and influence of Plato made it necessary for Cicero to defend rhetoric from the attacks of the philosophical schools. The post-Socratic schools (Cyrenaic, Cynic, Megarian) perpetuated the divorce between eloquence and philosophy (*De Oratore*, iii. 60-64). In Cicero's own day the Epicureans, who were second only to the Stoics in popularity, repeated some of the Platonic arguments. The Stoics advanced the syllogism as the instrument for attaining certainty, and the Epicureans, in a similar although opposite form, referred to the enthymeme as 'mere padding used to evoke applause.'[25] The Academy itself changed its former favorable attitude

[23] Pauly-Wissowa, M. Tullius Cicero, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Stuttgart, 1939) 1094.

[24] Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, i. 1. 1354b.

[25] Philodemus, *Rhetorica*, trans. H. M. Hubbell (New Haven, 1920) 4. 328; 7. 339.

towards rhetoric when Antiochus assumed the leadership. Cicero studied philosophy under Antiochus at Athens, but it was necessary for him to pursue the further study of rhetoric under a specialized teacher.

Cicero's constructive answer to the critique of the *Gorgias* is his reëstablishment of principles relating to the concept of the philosopher-orator-statesman. In addition to his own reasoning showing the superiority of one who can both *think* and *speak*, Cicero follows the tradition of Isocrates, the authority of Aristotle and the Peripatetic school, and the doctrines of the Middle and New Academy. Plato himself who recorded the original distinction between philosophy and eloquence and whose works exercised so powerful an influence was actually considered by Cicero as a witness in support of the Ciceronian position . To conclude his argument upholding the union of philosophy and eloquence, Cicero says that he regards Plato as the most eminent example of one who combines wisdom and skill in persuasion.

4

The evidence cited in this paper should not be interpreted to mean that Plato, or even the two later Academies, exerted the dominant influence upon Cicero in his theory of rhetoric. The actual body and substance of his rhetorical teachings stem largely from Isocrates, Aristotle, and Stoic writings.

Cicero makes his references to the Middle and New Academy, and to Plato, to support principles which in most instances had their inception elsewhere. As a matter of fact, the methods of reasoning and proof used by Arcesilaus and Carneades appear to be likely products of the dialectics of Aristotle. But during the earlier years of Cicero's life, the New Academy was the only philosophical school which vigorously championed the teaching of practical public speaking. The Peripatetic school had a rhetorical tradition from the time of Aristotle, but in Cicero's age this school had little influence. Cicero was of course highly pleased with the record of the Peripatetic school; the Academy, however, had a rhetorical tradition of a more recent date.

It is impossible here to restate in full the inadequacies which Cicero discovered in the Epicurean and Stoic conceptions of rhetoric. Briefly stated, neither the Epicurean approval of epideictic speaking nor the Stoic instruction in logical analysis and reasoning provided the bases for a complete theory of rhetoric.

In the field of philosophy Cicero is singled out as the greatest of the Roman eclectics. Much the same is the case with his rhetorical writings. He frankly reports that he is not devoted to 'one fixed leader' *(De Inventione*, ii. 2); he seeks and uses such materials as are 'most fully akin to the orator' *(De Oratore*, iii. 17. 64). In this sense one can perhaps understand why Cicero regarded himself as a Platonist, although he is not always faithful to the details of Platonic thought.

The central doctrine of the New Academy can best be summarized in Cicero's words when he says: 'I shall explain what you wish as best I can, not however as if I were the Pythian Apollo, making statements to be regarded as certain and unalterable,' *(Tusc. Disp.* i. 17). Certainly 'the spacious grounds of the Academy' to which Cicero refers in the *Orator* is the proper philosophical school to which a rhetorician should claim allegiance. And what is more, this choice apparently provided Cicero with the authority to select the aspects of Platonic writings which suited his purpose.

THE DECLINE OF THE PROFESSIONAL THEATRE IN AMERICA

Hubert C. Heffner

DURING the past year a number of articles on the aims, duties, and responsibilities of the academic theatre have appeared in various journals and even in the Drama Section of *The New York Times*. All revealed, though with vagueness and uncertainty, a feeling that the programs in theatre and drama in our colleges and universities were rather aimless and somewhat irrelevant to our modern American world.

I can remember, as can some of you, the spectacle upon the outbreak of war of certain theatre groups and other representatives of art organizations rushing to Washington, taking the time of busy government and army officials, to insist that theatre and art had a major place in 'winning the War' and that the specific organization represented should be given exclusive jurisdiction in the wielding of this 'mighty weapon of victory.' Deep in their hearts I wonder if these beggars did not know that in this moment of national crisis, theatre and art had no significant place, nothing of great importance that was indispensable? I am aware of the good work done by Special Services as a part of that housekeeping branch of our Army, and I am also aware that many of their theatrical productions were on a slightly higher level of entertainment than that offered by such competitors as prostitution and drink. I remember, too, that in the late Great Depression, theatre and the arts were dispensable and were among the first to be cut out of budgets and school programs.

Why do such conditions obtain within the realm of the arts and especially in theatre? Let us face the fact boldly at the outset. The truth is that the legitimate theatre, like sculpture and painting, is of relatively slight importance in the cultural life of the mass of American citizens. If the legitimate Broadway theatre disappeared tomorrow, less than one forty-eighth of the American people would be immediately aware of it. Less than two million Americans see a legitimate Broadway production on Broadway in any given year. Compare this figure with the more than sixty-five million Americans who go to the movies each week!

1

In the face of such conditions we in the academic theatre world are under grave and momentous obligations to consider well our own practice and our teaching. The decline of the professional theatre in America brings us face to face with stern realities. Those of you, however, whose acquaintance with the history of the American theatre is slight and whose acquaintance with present-day conditions in the professional theatre may be limited to viewing occasional performances and reading reviews of Broadway openings may raise questions about this so-called decline in our professional theatre and its consequences.[1]

HUBERT C. HEFFNER *is Professor of Drama at Stanford University and President of the American Educational Theatre Association. This article is based on his address before the AETA at the convention in Salt Lake City in December 1947.*

[1] For a full discussion of this decline, see my recent article in Volume I of the *Pacific Spectator*.

At the turn of this century there were over five thousand legitimate professional theatres, not counting music halls and opera houses, scattered throughout the length and breadth of this land. In 1946, there were only 231 legitimate theatres, opera houses, and music halls in the United States.[2] As nearly as I can estimate there were less than 200 legitimate professional theatres in existence in 1946, and of these approximately 32 were in the Times Square district of New York City. From over 5,000 to less than 200 in 46 years; is that a decline? At the turn of the century in all of our major cities, there were producing theatres engaged in producing new plays as well as in performing classic plays in repertory. Today the only producing theatre where new plays are regularly given a hearing and new productions of classics prepared is in New York City. Other cities of this land are entirely dependent upon this Broadway theatre for professional productions of legitimate plays. Occasionally, very occasionally, the Broadway theatre spills over into Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, Washington, Cleveland, Chicago, San Francisco, and other cities. When it does, it does so on Broadway terms. We have no longer an American theatre; what we have is a Broadway theatre. Plays are selected in terms of Broadway; plays are produced in terms of Broadway. If a new play succeeds or a revival wins a run, it does so on Broadway terms, not in terms of the American people as a whole.

This Broadway theatre is a good one of its kind. In terms of production it probably represents the highest artistic excellence thus far attained in America; in terms of its acting it is competent though not excellent. The London theatre is probably superior to it in the acting field; but all in all the Broadway theatre is the top theatre of the world at the present time. In terms of business this concentrated Broadway theatre reached its peak in the season of 1927-28, and has since then been steadily declining.

Again some figures will help us to see the picture. In 1927-28 there were 80 theatres in operation on Broadway; in 1946-47 there were 30. In 1927-28 there was a total of 302 productions on Broadway; in 1946-47 there were 87, which represented an increase of 8 over the previous season of 1945-46. In 1927-28 there was a total of 205 new legitimate plays produced on Broadway. The number of new plays produced declined each year thereafter until the season of 1941-42. In that season there was great rejoicing on Broadway and in the theatre press, because the decline had been arrested and 48 new plays had been produced, whereas the season before only 47 had been given a hearing. Unfortunately the jubilation was short-lived; in 1945-46 only 46 new plays were given a hearing and in 1946-47 only 42 new plays received a Broadway hearing.

The conditions which produced this decline in the Broadway theatre are still operative and in an aggravated manner. Though I do not believe the Broadway theatre will disappear, I do believe that this decline will continue unless drastic measures are taken and that eventually a Broadway season of about 50 total productions with only about 25 to 35 new plays given a hearing will become normal. Under such conditions what chances are there for any number of new playwrights, new designers, new actors? To be sure, some few new playwrights, some few new actors will find opportunities each season but I insist that their number will be few.

For further substantiation of these

[2] See *Statistical Abstract of the United States* (Washington, 1946).

facts let us look more carefully at the situation of the actor. In the season of 1919-20, when Broadway was just recovering from the Actors' Strike and beginning its rapid development to the peak, there was a total of 146 new productions, counting new plays, revivals, and musical productions. Of these, 96 were new plays. These 96 new plays offered a total of 1,421 acting roles. The 205 new plays produced in 1927-28 offered over 3,000 opportunities to actors for employment. In 1946-47 the 42 new plays offered a total of 619 roles for actors. Of course these figures do not take into account the opportunities offered in revivals and in musical plays; nor, on the other hand, do they take into account the doubling up of an actor in various roles in the different plays. I venture to state that the 619 opportunities in the 42 new plays were taken by far less than five hundred different actors. But we have even more accurate figures. According to the best available figures, Actors' Equity had in 1946-47 a paid-up membership of 6,300 members in good standing. Of these, 5,800 did not have any work of any kind in theatre during that season on Broadway. In other words, 500 actors found Broadway employment and 5,800 were out of work.

➡Lester Bernstein says:

> At least eight out of ten members of Actors' Equity are not working in the theatre but earning a livelihood—presumably—at an assortment of jobs ranging from those connected with the profession to such stop-gap stints as baby-sitting, department-store selling and waiting on tables. . . . For a couple of decades this has been growing into a chronic situation in the theatre.[3]

He ascribes three reasons for the recent acuteness of unemployment: First, the new productions done on Broadway. Second, 'Radio, the celebrated haven of the Broadway actor, has seen a boost in its actors' pay scale, with the result that sponsors are economizing in the number of players hired.' This is a highly significant statement which should be noted, for the reasoning on which it is based applies equally to the theatre. Third, Hollywood faced with the loss of British and foreign markets and with declining attendance here at home is slashing budgets, and actors are fleeing east. In the face of this situation Actors' Equity, which is the best of the theatrical unions but which shares a big responsibility for present-day conditions in the American theatre, belatedly established an Economic Betterment Committee to aid the unemployed actors. Their first suggestion was that Equity could find new ways for actor employment by extending its hand into the academic and community theatres. That suggestion, long on Equity records, is presently tabled for lack of practical ways of carrying it out. One of the reasons why I foresee continued decline in the Broadway theatre is that Equity, which has monopoly control over actors and to a considerable extent a control over productions, has had (until recently) no vision of the theatre as a national institution but is concerned solely with the immediate economic betterment of its members. Equity won its strike against an intolerable situation in 1919 and has since become a force in the decline of the American theatre.

I could multiply evidence of the decline in our professional American theatre and the more recent decline of the Broadway theatre, but I believe it may be more helpful to look briefly at some of the fundamental causes of this decline. The first cause was the gradual concentration in a single city with the resultant dependence of all citizens in

[3] Lester Bernstein, How to Eat, Though an Actor, Drama Section, *The New York Times*, 16 November 1947.

other cities of the land upon this single city for theatrical productions. This gradual concentration may be traced from about 1830. Since that date it has followed in broad and general outline the pattern of the development of American business as a whole—a pattern which has led to the concentration of the overwhelming percentage of American industry and business in the hands of 65 huge corporations. Indeed, the theatre not only follows and illustrates the pattern of American business as a whole but it projects and illuminates in little, I believe, what is happening to and will happen to the American business structure as a whole. The concentration of the theatre in New York City was made possible and hastened by the development of American railroads prior to the Civil War; by the practice of touring an entire new production complete with cast and scenery begun by Dion Boucicault in 1860; by the killing of the local, producing stock-company by these above mentioned factors and by the star systems; by the manipulations of the Theatrical Syndicate; and finally, by the control and dominance of the Theatrical Syndicate, organized in the season of 1895-96, which turned the theatre from a cultural institution into a business in the hands of business men knowing nothing and caring nothing about the art of the drama and the theatre but intent only upon box-office profits.

Secondly, the decline has occurred because the theatre is no longer operated as a sound business organization upon sound business bases. It is operated largely on a season-to-season, often on a show-to-show, basis without continuity, accumulation of experience, or attempt at long-range customer satisfaction. Each show is done as a fly-by-night gamble on its own. When the performances have run their course, the production organization is broken up and much of the staff may never work with each other again. As a result, theatre business has developed the avid interest of everyone concerned in the box office take. The slogan is 'get yours as soon and as completely as you can.' In fact, we are no longer justified in referring to this Broadway phenomenon as theatre business, for it is not a business. It is a gigantic gamble on a par with horse racing and slot machine gambling. Between 75 per cent and 85 per cent of all shows produced on Broadway fail. Note that fact. When the show fails, the producer loses his entire investment, the playwright collects no worthwhile royalties, the actors are out of jobs. Let us look at just two sets of figures.

In the season of 1934-35, there were 111 new plays produced on Broadway. Twenty-one of these made a profit of $1,815,000; ninety lost $1,420,000—leaving a net take on new plays for that season of $39,500. In the season of 1935-36 only 104 new plays were produced. Of these 21 made a profit of $2,020,000, while 84 lost $1,170,000. In 1946-47 the net take was $850,000 on news plays. I should point out that these figures do not include road and motion picture returns. The following figures are interesting for comparative purposes. The total Broadway take on all shows in the season of 1937-38 was $14,000,000. I do not have the motion picture figures for the year, but in 1939 the motion picture box-office receipts were $673,045,000, well over a half billion dollars.

In 1927-28 you could still do a Broadway play on a budget of $5,000. Alex Yokel's farce 'Three Men on A Horse,' which is said to have netted its producer over $650,000, is reported to have been

produced on a shoestring budget in Chicago for $1,800. In 1937 Alfred de Liagre produced 'Yes, My Darling Daughter' on a lavish budget of $18,000 and made a net profit of over $200,000. Today it is almost impossible to do even the simplest legitimate production on a budget of less than $50,000. That is rather large money to gamble on a new and untried script when you know that your chances of failure and hence of complete loss are between 75 and 85 per cent. In 1937 it cost nearly $150,000 to give the musical play 'I'd Rather Be Right,' a splendid production. For a statement of the situation today I give you the following summary by Murray Schumach quoted from an article in *The New York Times*, 25 August 1946:

> As for cost, the average musical budget should run at a minimum of $200,000 and perhaps as high as $350,000—witness 'Show Boat.' Using the smaller figure, that means the musical, to make any money at all, will have to run at least six months and in a large theatre, of which there are only about a half a dozen in town. Further, this six-months run will have to be before audiences that fill 80 per cent of the house at nearly every performance. If the musical is as expensive as 'Show Boat,' or 'Annie Get Your Gun'—which cost better than $300,000—the producer can't expect to come out ahead unless he keeps the house lit for ten months with 80 per cent capacity. In other words, a hit can be a financial 'flop.'
>
> To illustrate: 'Annie' was on the road nearly five weeks before hitting Broadway. Capacity houses greeted every performance. Yet in those weeks 'Annie' lost $40,000 because the theatres were not big enough.

Of the eleven musical shows produced on Broadway in 1946-47 only two broke even or made money. Musical shows reveal a wider range in the percentage of failure, ranging from 42 per cent in 1940-41 to 67 per cent in the previous season.

The third major cause for the decline of the Broadway theatre is the theatrical unions. These represent a potent and powerful force in the disintegration and decline, but we have no time to explore that force here.

The fourth major cause lies in the peculiar organizational set up of the Broadway theatre which deprives it of continuity and of self-perpetuation. Under such conditions Broadway simply cannot reproduce itself and must look elsewhere for new talent and new artists to keep it going. There is no place in this theatre for the beginner who must of necessity be somewhat mediocre in his art and no opportunity under the present system, of the long run or the quick flop, for the artist to gain the necessary experience and training or the necessary versatility in the practice of his art to perfect himself. It seems to be a truism that that which cannot reproduce itself must ultimately fossilize and die.

3

Up to this point we have been concerned with the facts and forces of decline in our professional theatre. Before turning to a brief consideration of the implications of this situation for the academic theatre, I must pay tribute to one phenomenon that may well prove to be a force for regeneration. I refer to the organization and development of the American National Theatre and Academy, that vigorous infant known as ANTA. ANTA represents action on the right front and deserves our wholehearted support. ANTA's crucial test will be to maintain a vision of the whole American theatre as a cultural institution of the American people rather than to accept the delusion that the Broadway theatre as it now exists should receive its major concern and effort. I would be happier about hopes for ANTA's future if its headquarters were moved from New York to Washington or some other American city, difficult as that move would be.

There are, it seems to me, two important implications of the decline of the professional theatre for educators in the field of theatre and drama.

First, any program in theatre and drama in a college or university that is based primarily upon training for the legitimate professional theatre—professional education, that is—is unworthy of academic recognition. Students enrolled in such a program are being trained for a profession that is virtually non existent. In addition, those students who are being given highly specialized technical training in lieu of genuine liberal education are being robbed of such an education. Training of undergraduates in high technical competency in the arts and crafts of theatre may produce some highly qualified technicians, provided a full four years are devoted to such technical training, but the end product will be highly skilled 'barbarian's without education. This, I fear, describes the condition that all too frequently obtains in our college theatre and drama programs.

Conversely, a worthwhile theatre and drama program included as a major part of a liberal or general educational program can furnish, rightly taught, genuinely humanizing training for undergraduates and for graduates. To explore this proposition fully we would first have to establish a philosophy of education, which in turn would be dependent upon a philosophy of life. Within the limitations of this paper, only a brief attempt can be made to define an educational philosophy. The Harvard Report on *Education in a Free Society* describes liberal education as education which frees the mind of man; frees man from ignorance, intolerance, and superstition, and frees him to know and to lead the good life. Aristotle states that that which peculiarly differentiates man from other animals, sets him apart and establishes his potential nobility, is intelligence. That education, then, which definitely and forcefully contributes to the development of man's intelligence is liberal education and good education. Training in drama and theatre is especially fitted to contribute to such an education, to the training of man's whole intelligence. It may combine training in knowledge with training in skill, training in understanding with training in action. It may combine training in right reasoning with training in judgment, training in straight thinking with training in evaluation; training in knowing with training in taste. It may combine training in individual accomplishment with training in cooperative enterprise. Such a program is not possible, however, if training in theatre is separated from training in dramatic literature, dramatic theory and analysis, the history of drama and the history of theatre. Such a training is not possible if the courses of instruction in theatre are taught by highly trained technicians who are essentially uneducated men and women.

4

In differentiating himself from other animals man has invented three great instruments for giving meaning to life—religion, art, and philosophy. Religion is basically a faith held in the face of the great and fearful unknown and its exercise involves an emotional identification. Philosophy is a deliberative and cognitive act, essentially devoid of emotion. Art, which lies midway between religion and philosophy in giving meaning to life, partakes of the emotional identification of religion and the rational explanation of philosophy.

The greatest of the arts is drama in all of its forms. Through tragedy man has explored his highest ideals and aspira-

tions as well as his deepest sins and most profound despairs. Through tragedy he has explored the utmost potentialities of the moral order and man's capabilities for action within and against the moral order. Through tragedy he has presented man's highest nobility as a deliberative and deciding being, and exhibited the psychological implications of the whole gamut of human emotions. Through tragedy he has aided our understanding and hence, to a definite extent, our banishment of human fears; and through tragic pity he has widened the possibilities of human compassion, human tolerance, and human unity. Through comedy he has exhibited for our laughter and our ridicule those human deviations from the normal which, were they allowed unhampered and uncensored development, would make us less human and less potentially noble. Through comedy he has taught himself to know the ridiculous and to purge the ridiculous through laughter and satire. Through melodrama, that third major form of drama, he has examined and explored human fear coupled, not with pity as in tragedy but with hate, which according to the psychologists is one of the three great major human emotions.

5

Drama rightly studied, then, is nothing less than the study of man as an essentially human being—man in society, man with a past as well as a future. It is the study of man as a rational and moral animal—man who without right reason can become a beast, man who with right reason can become in Hamlet's words, 'the paragon of animals, the beauty of the world.' Maxwell Anderson has summarized in significant and beautiful words this true meaning of theatre and drama:

> The theatrical profession may protest as much as it likes, the theologians may protest, and the majority of those who see our plays would probably be amazed to hear it, but the theatre is a religious institution devoted entirely to the exaltation of the spirit of man. It is an attempt to prove that man has a dignity and a destiny, that his life is worth living, that he is not purely animal and without purpose. There is no doubt in my mind that our theatre, instead of being, as the evangelical ministers used to believe, the gateway to hell, is as much of a worship as the theatre of the Greeks and has exactly the same meaning in our lives.[4]

Maxwell Anderson's entire essay should be read and pondered by every student and teacher of theatre and drama. It is a highly significant statement which helps us to comprehend more fully the national catastrophe which we have suffered in the loss of an American theatre. It should renew our determination to see that the American theatre lives again as a national institution of vital importance to every citizen of this Democracy. It can help teachers to perceive with greater clarity and with proper perspective the truly central place which theatre and drama as academic disciplines may occupy in our colleges and universities.

The subject matter of theatre and drama as a part of a true and liberal education cannot be taught by trained technicians, no matter how highly skilled, if those technicians are not themselves educated men. To tie such an educational program as this to mere professional training for the securing of a job in as sick a commercial enterprise as the present-day Broadway theatre is to betray a high trust—a betrayal which educational institutions of true integrity cannot long tolerate.

Lest it be assumed that instruction in theatre and drama as administered today is completely at variance with a liberal education, I wish to assert forcefully that much of our training is gen-

[4] Drama Section, *The New York Times*, 26 October 1941. Also reprinted in the preface to Anderson's 'Candle in the Wind.'

uinely liberalizing and educative. Nor would I have it understood that I am advocating instruction in drama divorced from theatrical performance and instruction in the techniques of theatre. Our academic theatres have potentially a very great role to play not only on our campuses but also in the pageant of the National American Theatre. Indeed, if there is to be a National American Theatre, the academic theatre must nurture and develop it. It is our responsibility to see the American theatre as a truly cultural institution in our democracy and as a unique instrument of adult education. Our academic theatres should be great conservatories of living drama as vital to our campuses and the communities they serve as are our museums and our libraries. In them every student should have the opportunity within a college generation to become intimately acquainted with his magnificent dramatic heritage through witnessing in living presentations artistic and sensitive interpretations of the great drama of all ages. The great drama should cease to be something read in a book.

How far we are from that goal is vividly and statistically told in an article[5] which confirms a suspicion, frequently voiced in *The New York Times* and elsewhere, that the vast majority of plays produced in our colleges are well-nigh worthless, that the college theatre is merely following and aping at long distance the Broadway theatre.

Why are we, too, betraying the American theatre? I suspect that the first reason is the lack of well-defined educational policy. I am inclined to believe that the second reason arises out of the limitations in the education of some of the directors in the college theatres. The third reason, often expressed, is that immature student actors are not technically equipped to interpret adequately many of the difficult roles of the great plays. A system of artists-in-residence that brought mature and skilled professional actors on reasonable stipends to our campuses to play with our student actors, and a system of junior-artists-in-residence fellowships that brought technically qualified young actors to college for further study and practice would obviate this third difficulty. On a similar basis why should not our academic theatres become the homes of great resident stock-companies dedicated not only to the maintenance of our priceless dramatic heritage but also to the productions of worth-while new plays that may well become a part of that heritage?

If academic programs in drama and theatre are not to be highly expendable with the coming of a depression, if they again are not to appear as importunate beggars with the coming of a war, if they are not to follow the same decline that has marked the American theatre—then educators in the field of theatre and drama must act, must act rationally and intelligently, must act now.

[5] John E. Dietrich, Dramatic Activity in American Colleges: 1946-1947. QJS 32 (April 1948).183-90.

COLLEGE PLAY PRODUCTION ORGANIZATION

Jack Morrison

ACCELERATION in the development of curricular and extracurricular theatre activities in American universities and colleges has made it appear wise to survey with care the present trends of play production organization in our institutions of higher learning. According to authoritative sources[1] there were no departments or courses concerned with play production until George Pierce Baker's 47 Workshop at Harvard in the first decade of this century. There are now 318 or more departments of specialization or concentration in Dramatic Art in the four-year colleges throughout the country.[2] In addition, many colleges and universities carry on programs of play production on a less specialized scale or as an extracurricular activity.

This survey, which was undertaken in an effort to establish a basis for student-faculty relationships, is concerned 1. with existing methods of organizing college play production and 2. with the relationship between curricular (departmental) and extracurricular (student body) participation in college and university theatre activity.[3] A questionnaire was designed to discover methods and procedures now in use, and the opinions of theatre workers as to the relationship of participation in the play production program. The results delineate a profile of play production organization with which similar work on any given campus may be compared.

After the questionnaire was checked in a preliminary survey, certain colleges and universities in the 48 states and territories were arbitrarily selected from the 1,700 institutions of higher education listed in the *Educational Bulletin, 1946-7*, Part 3, of the Office of Education. A total of 311 questionnaires were sent to 285 institutions.[4]

Of the 311 questionnaires sent out, 187 or 60 per cent were returned. Nine were void because of no answers or incomplete answers and five were received too late for tabulation. The balance of 173 questionnaires, representing 166 institutions, was used in tabulating the results. This means that of the 285 institutions canvassed, 184 or 65 per cent made replies, with 166 valid for tabulating purposes.

The results of the questionnaires follow. Each question is stated, and then followed with the replies given in terms of percentage. A more generalized pat-

JACK MORRISON *is a Lecturer in Theatre Arts at the University of California at Los Angeles. He was formerly Director of Theatre Activities for the Associated Students, UCLA.* *This article is a brief summary of a report made at the Salt Lake City Convention of the American Educational Theatre Association in December 1947.*

[1] Kenneth Macgowan, *Footlights across America* (1929) 113; and Norris Houghton, *Advance from Broadway* (1941) 136.

[2] Carter V. Good, editor, *A Guide to Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools in the United States*, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C. (1946) 681.

[3] Special acknowledgments are due to the Associated Students UCLA for authorizing and financing the study and to the AETA Committee on College and University Theatre under whose auspices the questionnaire was distributed.

[4] There are 1,700 institutions of higher education (colleges and universities—711, professional schools—260, teachers colleges and normal schools—204, junior colleges—418, institutions for Negroes—107) listed in the *Educational Bulletin, 1946-47*. This investigation represents 166 or 9.8 per cent of the total number (1,700). Seven hundred and eleven colleges and universities are listed, and this investigation represents 123 or 17.3 per cent of that section of schools in higher education in the United States at this time.

tern of the results will be given at the close of the paper.

1a. The name of the principal play producing organization is —. (omitted because of space limitations)

1b. How many major productions (not studio or workshop) are given each year? One — 4.0%; two — 13.5%; three — 17.5%; four — 21%; five — 10.0%; six — 13.0%; seven — 10.5%; eight — 5.5%; nine — 1.0%; ten — 1.5%; eleven — .5%; twelve or more — 2.0%.

2. Participation in the play-production organization (principal one) is restricted to: Students enrolled in drama classes only — 7.5%; undergraduates only — 29%; undergraduates and graduates — 27%; campus community — 16.5%; campus and town community — 5%; no restrictions — 15%.

3. The plays are selected by: Managing director — 33%; head of academic department — 16%; student committee — 12%; faculty staff — 20.5%; student-faculty committee — 18%; other — .5%.

4. The plays are directed by: Faculty — 88%; graduate student — 9%; alumni — 0%; off-campus amateur coach — 1.5%; off-campus professional director — 1.5%.

5. Casting is done by: Director of play — 74.5%; director of play and student advisors — 9%; managing director — 4%; head of academic department — 2%; student committee — 2.5%; faculty staff — 3%; student-faculty committee — 3%; other — 2%.

6. The crew chiefs on the shows (props, lights, costumes, etc.) are selected by: Managing director — 30%; head of academic department — 7.5%; student committee — 11.5%; faculty staff — 9.5%; student-faculty committee — 8%; a technicians' club — 1%; technical director — 26%; other — 6.5%.

7a. The box office receipts of the play production program are deposited to: University comptroller — 16.5%; academic department — 4%; general student body fund — 15%; producing organizations fund — 43%; special theatre fund — 13.5%; no admission charged — 10%; other — 3%.

7b. Any losses on the production program are made up by: University administration — 17.5%; departmental funds — 15%; student body funds — 23%; theatre reserve fund — 21%; curtailed program following season — 4%; other — 11%; no losses — 8.5%.

7c. Total annual production expense (direct cost of shows — not including salaries or plant depreciation) is: 0-$1,000 — 33%; $1,000-$2,000 — 18%; $2,000-$3,000 — 13%; $3,000-$4,000 — 15%; $4,000-$6,000 — 8.5%; $6,000-$8,000 — 5.5%; $8,000-$10,000 — 2.5%; $10,000-$15,000 — .5%; $15,000-$20,000 — 2.5%; more than $30,000 — 1.5%.

8. Each play is organized as: Completely separate unit with own personnel and budget — 26%; integrated unit within a season's program to which personnel and budget are allotted from producing organization — 74%.

9a. The academic department which concerns itself with the play production program is the department of: Drama — 17%; Speech — 22.5%; Speech and Drama — 24%; Theatre Arts — 5%; Public Speaking — 1.5%; English — 18.5%; other — 5.5%; no department — 6.0%.

9b. How many full-time play production personnel are in the department? One — 31%; two — 21.5%; three — 19.5%; four — 8.5%; five — 5.5%; six — 4%; seven — .5%; eight — 5%; nine — 3%; ten or more — 1.5%.

9c. How many majors are in the department? 0-10 — 21%; 11-20 — 22%; 21-30 — 9%; 31-40 — 15%; 41-50 — 6%; 51-75 — 2%; 76-100 — 8%; 101-150 — 10%; 151-200 — 6%; more than 200 — 1%.

9d. The productions are staged in: Complete well-planned, well-built theatre: — 15.5%; reasonably suitable theatre building — 18%; auditorium more or less suitable — 49.5%; an adapted room — 2.5%; temporary make-shift — 1.5%; rentals off-campus — 10.0%; other — 3%.

10. The organization of dance group theatre, live opera, or spectacles and pageants is under the supervision of: Director of play production — 17.5%; physical education department, division of dance — 19%; music department — 20%; several departments — 36.5%; other — 7%.

11. This question asked for the individual to agree fully, agree partially, disagree, or strongly disagree with nine statements according to his own judgment in light of his present and past experience in educational theatre.

The nine statements were:

a. The department should administer the play production program completely, assigning all personnel (cast, crew, managers) from students enrolled in its academic classes only.

b. The department should administer the play production program completely as above but not restrict undergraduate participation to majors and members of classes in the department. All-university student participation should be allowed in casts, crews, and management.

c. The department should administer the play production program completely but invite suggestions for program, personnel, and management from interested individual students

but not from organized student pressure clubs and groups.

d. The department should administer the play production program completely but invite student organization representatives whom the department would appoint to sit in an advisory capacity with a departmental board. This board would assist in determining policy which would affect the choosing of program, personnel, and management.

e. The department should control the play production program completely but determine policy in conjunction with a joint faculty-student board on which faculty in the department would have a majority of voting members.

f. The department should control the play production program completely but determine policy in conjunction with a joint faculty-student board on which faculty and students have an equal number of voting members.

g. The department should administer its own play production program as an academic discipline and the student body its own play production organization as an extra-curricular activity, the two working together on a production when it is mutually satisfactory.

h. The department should administer its own play production program, and the student body should operate its play production program each quite independently.

i. There should be no department administering a play production program, and the effectiveness of any undergraduate play production organization should directly reflect the creative skills and talents of the current undergraduate membership.

A scattergram, omitted here (see profile), was used to tabulate the results for this question.

From this evidence it is possible to devise a national profile of college play production organization. Against it may be projected any individual institution's organization, and its relative position thereby determined. Such comparison should be of value to administrators and theatre workers alike as a check on growth, budget, methods, and procedures. Here, in sum, is the profile:

1. Most college play production organizations produce an average of four plays a year. (Most of the schools reporting, 54.5%, do from three to seven productions per year. 35% do three plays or less annually. Relatively few, 11.5%, do more than seven per year, and only 4% do 10 or more.)

2. Participation is usually restricted to enrolled students. (Approximately three-fifths of the campuses reporting or 63.5% restrict participation to enrolled students, while 29% allow undergraduates only to participate. Only 7.5% restrict participation to those who are enrolled in drama classes, and about one-third, 36.5% of the institutions, allow others than enrolled students to participate. Others include faculty, alumni, townspeople, students from other colleges, and guest artists in that order.)

3. The director and/or head of the department almost always selects the plays. (Play selection in almost one-half of the cases, 49%, is in the hands of one person, the director and/or the head of the department. The student committee and joint student-faculty committee is used about one-third, 30%, of the time with the faculty staff as a group accounting for 20.5% of the choices. Other methods listed include individual selection by directors with final approval by faculty staff.)

4. The director and/or head of the department almost always directs the plays. (The faculty member is well established as the director of college productions, with 88%. Off-campus talent is negligible but the graduate student, 9%, gets an occasional opportunity to direct. Other comment points out that students get their opportunities to direct in class-room productions.)

5. The director and/or head of the department almost always casts the plays. (The director is the one person who, in a decided majority of the cases, 74.5%, casts the play. In less than 10% of the cases is casting done by a group process. Other methods sometimes call for the director's getting approval for the cast from the staff and/or student committee.)

6. In a plurality of the cases the director also selects the technical staff, but in the technical area, more than in the preceding three, the director may have this responsibility taken by someone else. (The director and/or academic head of the department accounts for the large plurality, 37.5%, of technical appointments, with the technical director appointing the heads in 26% of the cases. Student and student-faculty appointments, however, take 19.5%. Faculty staff as a group appoint 9.5%. Other methods include assignments as classwork, student selections with faculty approval, director selections with staff approval.)

7a. Box office receipts are deposited to a theatre production fund in most cases. (As far as depositing receipts go, a majority of schools, 56.6%, report that the producing organizations them-

selves operate their own accounts as separate funds. In 16.5% of the cases, the college business office on its own or through an academic department carries the account on its books. 15% are deposited to general student body funds. Only 5% do not charge admission. Other methods include special funds handled by student body or college, adjustments with student dues cards.)

7b. Losses are absorbed fairly evenly by four main accounts: administration, departmental, student body, and special theatre production funds. (Student body funds constitute the buffer for losses in more cases than any other, 23%. Theatre reserve funds take 21% of the losses, university administration 17.5%, departmental funds 15%, while few, 4%, curtail the following season's program to recoup. Other methods include reducing budgets on following plays, using student activities fund from Dean of Students office. 8.5% reported that they do not have losses.)

7c. More than half the producing theatres reporting spend less than $2,000 on a production a year, while a few go over $10,000. (About one-half or 51% of the colleges reporting spend less than $2,000 on direct production expenses annually. 36.5% spend between $2,000 and $6,000. From this point there is a sharp drop in schools which spend more than $6,000. Only 4.5% spend $10,000 or more per year.)

8. A large majority of institutions plan an integrated season of plays. (74% of the organizations plan their seasons as an integrated program with the balance of 26% working on a show-to-show basis.)

9a. Departments participating in play production are usually called Drama, Speech, or Speech and Drama. (Distribution in the names of departments which are concerned with production is fairly well distributed: Drama, Speech and Drama together account for 63.5%; English, 18.5%; Public Speaking, 1.5%; Theatre Arts, 5%. In 6% of the cases no department is concerned. Other departments which participate are Radio, Speech and Theatre; Theatre of the School of Speech; Dramatic Arts; Fine Arts; School of Drama; Speech Division of the English Department.)

9b. There are usually less than three full-time paid personnel in the department. (72% report a staff of one to three full-time paid personnel. Almost a third, 31%, are one-man departments. 16% have a staff of from four to six members, but only 10% have more than six.)

9c. Less than thirty majors are generally enrolled in the department. (43% of the schools reporting majors [76 reported no majors] have 20 or fewer enrolled. 30% have from 20-50 majors, and 10% from 50-100 majors. 17% have more than 100.)

9d. The productions are usually staged in a more or less suitable auditorium. (Less than a quarter have suitable theatre buildings. 15.5% of those reporting indicated that their architectural facilities were complete and suitable. 18% were reasonably suitable. In a majority of cases, 49.5%, plays were reported produced in a more of less suitable auditorium. A few campuses, 4%, have adapted or used makeshift rooms and 10% rent off-campus.)

10. Dance shows, operas and spectacles, are seldom supervised by the director of play production and are usually supervised by several departments by employing various administrative devices. (Here is a fairly even distribution. The director of play production supervises 17.5% of the dance, opera, spectacle type of production; physical education, division of dance, 19%; and the music department, 20%. Collaboration of departments accounts for 36.5% of the methods; and *others* include whoever wants to do them—clubs organized for that purpose, Glee Club Director, Director of Dance, outside talent. There was more modification and elaboration on this question than on any other of the first ten questions.)

11. It can be fairly reliably held that there is a strong general trend away from strictly extra-curricular play production organization to a more co-curricular or extra-class type of activity with definite academic control by the academic staff. (This strong trend, however, is halted before there is a completely closed departmental participation and authority and before student participation in administration and policy matters is altogether done away with. The abrupt halt suggests there may be a gradation to allow for various types of student participation in both policy and operation to suit various institutions. It is here that the opportunity for a truly creative development in the administration of college theatre activities is indicated.)

APPIA FIFTY YEARS AFTER: I

H. Darkes Albright

'He is not precise: his vision reveals the incomplete and enigmatic character common to all prophecy.'

Music and the Scene[1] was published in 1899. In the half-century that has followed, what has become of its hopes and expectations? From Gordon Craig to Lee Simonson, from Robert Edmond Jones to Eric Bentley, writers on drama and the theatre have testified to Adolphe Appia's stature as a prophet of the twentieth-century theatre. Where in 1949 do we still see traces of his work or of his theory; where at least in America find signs of his influence?

To *Music and the Scene* Appia added in 1921 *The Work of Living Art*.[2] Neither of these books has been widely read or indeed has ever been published in an English translation. As the few who have tried either the reading or the translating would agree, both tasks are extremely difficult and complex. The French text in which most of Appia's writing appears (and particularly the German text of the published *Music and the Scene*, which had originally been prepared in French)[3] is not only complicated aesthetically and philosophically, but elusive as to choice of words and turn of phrase. Yet in Lee Simonson's opinion, 'The first hundred and twenty pages [of *Music and the Scene*] are nothing less than the textbook of modern stage-craft.'[4]

From varying points of view, several efforts have been made within the past two decades to outline or summarize in English, portions of Appia's aesthetic beliefs.[5] Because of the special requirements of the present study, and to the general ends of clarity and completeness, I am attempting here a brief recapitulation of those beliefs, based principally on *Music and the Scene* and *The Work of Living Art*.[6] As all but the occasional reader would be aware from the outset, Appia's earliest theories of theatrical art were profoundly influenced by Wagnerian music-drama and by Wagner's notion of a union of all the arts. Agreeing in most respects with the Wagnerian concept, he took special issue in regard to stage decoration. In *Music and the Scene*, he advocated a system of production which he felt was organically related to the drama and its action, and at the same time generally indicated the adaptations he would require in Wagner's 'unified' art-form.

Appia's later theories, as expressed in *The Work of Living Art*, can be looked upon as extensions and amplifications of those already described. Here the influence of Emile Jaques-Dalcroze,

H. DARKES ALBRIGHT *is Associate Professor of Speech and Drama at Cornell University and is Past President of the American Educational Theatre Association.* *This is Part I of an article surveying the nature of Adolphe Appia's influence on the contemporary theatre; Part II will follow in the next issue.*

[1] Adolphe Appia, *Die Musik and Die Inscenierung* (Munich, 1899).

[2] *L'Oeuvre D'art Vivant* (Geneva and Paris, 1921).

[3] A copy of the original French manuscript of this work is now the property of the Cornell University Library.

[4] Lee Simonson, *The Stage Is Set* (New York, 1932) 354-5.

[5] In Simonson's volume, quoted above; in an Appia memorial issue of *Theatre Arts* 16 (1932); and in W. R. Fuerst and S. J. Hume, *Twentieth Century Stage Decoration* (London, 1928).

[6] *The Staging of Wagnerian Music-Drama—La Mise en Scène du Drame Wagnerien* (Paris, 1895); and *Living Art or Dead Nature?—Art Vivant ou Nature Morte?* (Milan, 1923) contain much the same material and adhere to much the same point of view.

Appia's close friend and collaborator, and of what we have come to know as Dalcroze Eurhythmics, is clearly indicated. At this point, Appia was more firmly convinced than ever of the importance of the actor's body as a 'means-of-expression'; and, in a rather specialized way, had decided to make it a 'point-of-departure' in a new and ideal theatrical art.

1

A good starting point in examining Adolphe Appia's aesthetic system is to be found in his criticism of Wagner. Fundamentally, this criticism was concerned with two mutually dependent but yet fairly distinct items: the apparent lack of harmony between Wagner's musical-poetical drama and the visible elements of his scene; and, secondly, the apparent impossibility of fusing Wagner's several contributory arts while any one of them was, so to speak, operating at high intensity.[7] To solve the Wagnerian contradictions, Appia proposed his own conception—a 'word-tone drama' in which the contributing elements (words, music, and the various elements in the *mise en scène*) are not only 'combined' but synthesized through mutual subordination of the several elements. The elements, thus organized into a hierarchy rather than competing on equal terms, would have a single aim: the embodiment of the vision of a single artist, the word-tone poet. Appia wrote:

A work of art, considered from the standpoint of form, is not a mere reproduction of this or that aspect of life, to which everyone can add something through his experience and skill, but is . . . much more the effect upon one person of various sorts of experiences and practices in art, harmoniously combined and expressed by him with the one intention of conveying *his* conception—the conception of the one to the minds of the many.[8]

To Appia, music—which, after Wagner and Schopenhauer, he described as the direct expression of our inner being and looked upon as conditioned by an inner reality—was the supreme regulating force in the word-tone art. Music, as the pre-eminent art of time, can regulate the movements of the human body in space and thus can control Space as well as Time; bodily movements in space can become 'visible realizations of musical time-durations.' In Appia's view,

the human body, if it voluntarily accepts the modifications that music demands, assumes the rank of a means-of-expression in art; it forsakes its life of caprice and accident so that it may express, under the direction of the music, some essential characteristic, some important idea, more clearly than in normal life.[9]

But music can control not only the actor, but through him the inanimate portions of the scene. Here Appia set up a principle of 'opposition' between the body and the weight or solidity expressed in scenic forms:

Let us imagine a square, vertical column, with sharply-defined angles. This column rests, with no base, on horizontal slabs. It gives an impression of solidity, of power to resist. A living body approaches. Out of the contrast between its movement and the quiet immobility of the column is born a sensation of expressive life, a sensation that the body without the column or the column without the advancing body could not have evoked. . . . Finally the body leans against the column, and the latter's immobility offers a point of solid support: the column resists; it *acts*. The opposition has created life in an inanimate form—space has become living.[10]

In a similar fashion, inanimate objects can become expressive through contrasts with the human body as to line and mass. Thus music, by way of the body, can control not only the scenic space but the inanimate forms therein.[11]

[7] I have examined this aspect of Appia's case in Musical Drama As A Union of All the Arts, in *Studies in Speech and Drama* (Ithaca, New York, 1944).

[8] *Music and the Scene*, 3.

[9] *The Work of Living Art*, 37-8.

[10] Ibid., 42.

[11] Appia developed this principle of contrast between the mobility of the body and the im-

Above all, the word-tone drama itself and all its elements must be 'expressional' rather than meaningful or representational; indeed, all art must be so. Appia felt, for example, that one of the fundamental problems in all aesthetics is 'the question of a *Subject* for a work of art' and of the degree to which an art-work admits of a subject, at least one that requires a title. He recognized, however, that there are some factors in every dramatic text—certain meaningful elements as opposed to expressional ones (e.g., such factors as those said to have been furnished by a Shakespearean signboard) —which the hierarchical elements (music, the body, space, light, and color) can not be responsible for. These non-expressional, non-hierarchical factors Appia named *symbolization*.

Symbolization must necessarily be kept at a minimum. The truly expressive elements will use it only in urgent cases; and, just as a Shakespearean signboard gave only incomplete details of a countryside or a building, so symbolization in Appia's terms needs to supply only bare suggestions. That is to say, 'music is not fitted to express what is peculiar to a laborer's cottage, an architectural style, or a particular type of plant; all this belongs to the part of a play that appeals to our understanding . . . and should be present only insofar as is necessary to make the text understood.'[12]

In some cases light will be able to 'approximate the symbolization'; light can sometimes be concretely expressive by way of the form or movement of a shadow, the color or direction of a beam of light—as with a trellis whose patterns of light and shade, formed offstage, can be cast on the ground or the walls of a setting.

But beyond these aesthetic and technical facets of Appia's conception of a 'living' art, he gradually developed cultural and ethical views[13] which were as unconventional as others that have already been described. In one additional respect Appia saw art as organic: art and life must in the future operate reciprocally; 'living' art must become the preeminent social art. It was to Appia a sign of the times that art was in his day a sort of luxury and ornament, a kind of artifice distinctly separate from one's everyday existence. In the normal social-artistic life of the future, he hoped, audiences would not be merely onlookers or auditors but collaborators, in a sense participants; and as one aspect of this development, he projected a 'liberated' playing space and a theatre building freed from the 'arbitrary conventions of a dying past.'[14] To him, if not to the generation that followed him, the cen-

mobility and solidity of the setting most fully, though not solely, in his later volumes; and it is most clearly manifested in his later designs, some of which are discussed in Section II.

[12] *Music and the Scene*, 48.

[13] These were set forth principally in *Living Art or Dead Nature?* and in the concluding portions of *The Work of Living Art*. In the latter, see especially the sections entitled Fusion, Collaboration, The Great Unknown and the Experience of Beauty, and Bearers of the Flame.

[14] Especially for experimental work, Appia envisioned relatively simple buildings or studios, designed, as he put it, merely as a place in which to work, and with no arbitrary line of demarcation between stage and audience. Appia apparently had in mind some development of the hall in which he and Jaques-Dalcroze had worked at Hellerau, near Dresden. Here players and audience were bathed in the same light; and the 'stage' consisted of a platform divided into three parts which were themselves connected by steps. Only such properties as were absolutely necessary to the action were used—a table, a seat, or, as in the case of 'Orpheus,' a funeral urn. A description of the Great Hall, at Hellerau, with references to 1913 productions of Gluck's 'Orpheus' and Claudel's 'Annunciation,' appears in the 1914 *Stage Yearbook* (London, 1914). Another brief description of the staging of 'Annunciation' (which is known more familiarly as 'L'Announce Faite a Marie') appears in Kenneth Macgowan's *The Theatre of Tomorrow* (London, 1923), together with photographs of the Hall at Hellerau; the photographs are reproduced in *Theatre Arts* 6.175-6. Jacques Copeau worked with a somewhat similar arrangement in Paris in the early 1920's and later in Bourgogne. An early reference to the Copeau experiments is also to be found in Macgowan.

tral fact about his 'living' art was its potentialities for drawing us all together in a communal Experience of Beauty and for revivifying our daily lives. Dimly and mystically, he saw the outlines of what he himself described as aesthetic socialism.

2

The two basic principles which I have examined thus far—control of the actor and the *mise en scène* through music, and the expressional nature of the whole art-work—have of course rather definite and special implications with regard to stage-mounting, and have had their greatest impact in this phase of theatrical production. To begin with, there is little place indeed for painting, as such, in Appia's scheme of things. The living body of the actor is ridiculously out of relation to the best of painted scenes; the actor moves before them but not in them. Accordingly, Appia attacked the problem of scenic design by regarding the stage floor as an actual base for the whole of a stage-picture and by conceiving this base, in the finished setting, as a fused and plastic unit. Instead of the compromises of the nineteenth-century stage, he proposed a true development in space, a plastic recession of architectural planes, organically related one to the other and to the stage floor.

In Appia's view, the factor necessary to unify the parts of a scenic whole, and to render them fully expressive, is light —not merely illumination but 'living,' 'ambient,' 'plastic' light which casts its own shadows. Light can mean mere visibility no more than music can mean mere noise; indeed, light should be to a dramatic presentation what music is to its text, an element of pure expression rather than one of rational meaning. Appia's light, as suggested in theory and indicated in his own designs, was enveloping and space-filling. His lights and shadows were real details in a stage-picture conceived as a volume, not merely atmospheric and decorative additions to two-dimensional backdrops and wings. Still another virtue in 'living' light lies in its mobility. By light-changes in form, color, or movement, the scene itself can be made to move. Again, color should be looked upon as a derivative of light; renouncing 'the fictitious role it has in painting,' color should be either an actual part of real plastic forms or else an actual part of the light that reveals such forms in space. The hierarchy of elements is thus complete.

Primarily, then, Appia's scene was expressional in principle and opposed to the amassing of representational detail. Again, it was planned to emphasize the actor and his living presence. Designed with the three-dimensional body of the actor as its point-of-departure, it eliminated everything (e.g., flat lighting, two-dimensional scenery, and excessive or naturalistic detail) contradictory to that presence. Finally, Appia's scene—and the theories as to an ideal dramatic art-form which it in part represented—presupposed harmony and synthesis; singleness and control in form, conception, and execution; and plastic unity of effect in space.

Implied here, and clearly evident in his designs, is the 'suggestive simplification' for which Appia has been popularly known in recent years. Even in his earliest designs, one can observe a certain emphasis on simple, at times almost geometrical, forms, levels, ramps, and steps. In his rendering of 'Tristan and Isolde' (1896), for example, and of 'The Valkyrie' (1892),[15] the units are arranged

[15] No. 7 and No. 4 in *Adolphe Appia* (Zurich, 1929), a portfolio of reproductions of Appia's work. Fifty-six designs are included in this admirable collection, beginning with the 'Rhinegold' and others dated 1892 and concluding with a relatively large group dated 1926. Seven items from this portfolio are reproduced in *Theatre Arts* 16.645-8.

and combined in such a way as to give schematic impressions of natural or architectural forms; but only incidentally do they ever indicate actualistic forms in detail. Above all, the units or combinations of units are relatively few in number and uniformly simple in design and arrangement. Appia's treatment of the column-like trees for the Sacred Forest in 'Parsifal' (1896),[16] a design which, like the two named above, has been rather frequently reproduced, is also in point here.

In the later designs—that is to say, most of those planned after his collaboration with Jaques-Dalcroze—the simplicity of scene is of course even more marked. Some of these are intended only as what Appia called rhythmic spaces; others, like those for Acts II and III of 'King Lear' (1926),[17] are projects for conventional productions in which a minimum of symbolization has been made to suffice and in which the designer's lately-developed principle of weight and solidity is apparent. A striking example of the influence of the Dalcroze period on Appia's conceptions is to be found in a comparison between the design for 'The Valkyrie' (1892), already cited, and a later treatment of the same setting (1924).[18] In the latter we see the same general proportions and overall effect in the forms, and an almost identical distribution of space and mass in all directions. In the 1924 version, however, the angles have been sharpened and the steps and levels made distinct; the atmosphere is clearer and colder and harder, and the few details of trees showing in the earlier version have disappeared.

With all of the designs, however, the ultimate effect of such simplification naturally depends on Appia's mastery of the problems of light. This mastery is reflected in the draftsmanship of the designs themselves, which usually strike the observer as directly translatable in terms of the theatre, and in terms of light in the theatre. But fortunately we have left to us also several sets of stage-directions—light-scores, as it were—which clearly suggest Appia's imaginative grasp of theatrical values and his sure feeling for technical detail. In *Music and the Scene*, such stage-directions accompany the designs for both 'Tristan' and the 'Ring'; and somewhat similar interpretative commentary appears in *The Staging of Wagnerian Music-drama* and *The Work of Living Art*.

Appia's light-score for Act II of 'Tristan'[19] is particularly impressive. Unit by unit, scene by scene, he traces and accompanies the dramatic development, marking shifts of focus or value by such specific cues as 'p. 112, *ff*. of the orchestra: "Mein!" ' and 'p. 162, first *ff*. of the orchestra.' If Appia had written little else, he would in such passages as these have suggested the path of the modern lighting artist. Through proper zoning and control of intensities, for instance, the twentieth-century designer suggests infinite distance—with a subtlety and yet a valid effectiveness that perhaps only Appia of all his contemporaries anticipated. Through variation in

[16] No. 8 in the *Adolphe Appia* portfolio. This rendering has been reproduced (from *The Work of Living Art*) also in Sheldon Cheney's *Stage Decoration* (New York, 1928) Plate 75, and elsewhere. The Cheney volume includes also three designs from 'The Valkyrie.'

[17] Nos. 45 and 46 in the portfolio; reproduced in *Theatre Arts* 16.647.

[18] No. 35 in the portfolio, as compared with No. 7, cited above, dated 1892. The 1892 version, which appeared first in *Music and the Scene*, is reproduced also at the top of the page facing 82 in Macgowan. A total of eight reproductions, including some of the items discussed here, appear in Fuerst and Hume 2. Plates 36-41; and a total of six in Simonson 505-7.

[19] *Music and the Scene*, 241-3; Appia's own conception of the successive stages in the lighting of this act is shown in the four designs immediately following 278. This 'Tristan' commentary is translated in Simonson 362-3.

color, direction, and intensity, he directs and focuses audience-attention, and he avoids distraction by submerging momentarily irrelevant details in vagueness and diffusion.

The modern designer realizes that many simplified scenes can depend primarily on light for their effectiveness; that light-beams can pick suggestive details out of space, and that shadows or projections can subtly assist in expressive and evocative representation. He is aware that the aesthetic reality and validity of details on the stage (and their concrete suggestiveness, as well) obviously depend not so much on the aggregate amount of light which strikes them as on the manner in which some light falls on them and reveals their nature and form. Finally, as again Appia foresaw, the modern designer knows that—like the creatively designed setting as a whole—the lighting pattern can be beautiful in itself while at the same time it is focusing and emphasizing dramatic values and pointing up subjective elements in the action.

3

It would be pretentious and, I believe, unrewarding to attempt to trace absolute cause-and-effect relationships between what we find in Appia's prose or Appia's designs and what we find in the theatrical theory and the typical scene-designs of our own generation. Obviously enough—though he was in the vanguard—Adolphe Appia's work was but one aspect of a much broader sweep of aesthetic change. Slogans and prophecies of revolution in the theatre, most of them long since familiar to American readers, were in the air everywhere just after the turn of the century. Some of these seem now to have been reactions against archeology and naturalism, some against the peepshow stage itself, some against nothing in particular except perhaps the status quo. Yet at one point or another Appia's work was akin to most of them. As a single instance, if out of the mass of conflicts, contradictions, and complexities of our early-century theatrical revolution, we were arbitrarily to select some common denominator, we might well choose stylization. The term appears (i.e., as *Stil* or *Stilbühne*) again and again, in German theatrical criticism in particular, between 1905 and 1925.[20] In the sense of *typisieren* and *vergeistigen*, the term stylization has frequently been applied to Max Reinhardt and his artist-collaborators, Roller, Orlik, and Stern; and it has of course been associated with Craig, with certain of the Russians, and with some of our American designers as well. Yet, though so far as I know Appia never used the term and though his background and point-of-attack did not lead him to arrive at the particular concept which the term represents, much in his own aesthetic system is closely akin to it.

Nevertheless, in the so-called new theatre and new stagecraft of the past three or four decades, much has persisted that is clearly, if not uniquely, Appia's. Whatever the casual interrelationships involved, the influences and counter-influences, a certain priority is demonstrably his. *Music and the Scene* itself appeared in 1899; *The Staging of Wagnerian Music-drama* even earlier (1895); and some of his most characteristic designs (e.g., for 'The Valkyrie,' cited above) are dated 1892. As some readers may need to be reminded, Georg Fuchs' *Revolution in the Theatre* was not published until 1909, Gordon Craig's *On the Art of the Theatre* until 1911. Alexander Bakshy's *The Path of the Modern Russian Stage* is dated 1916,

[20] E.g., in the works of Hagemann, and in periodical literature. See, for example, Das Wesen der Stilbühne, in *Die Scene (Blätter fur Buhnenkunst)* 8.33-7.

The Theatre Unbound 1923. The first production of Reinhardt's 'Midsummer Night's Dream' was in January, 1905, and other production experiments and developments on the continent came even later. Robert Edmond Jones' 'The Man Who Married a Dumb Wife' appeared in this country in 1915.

In effect, Adolphe Appia set the staging pattern—or was first articulate about the staging pattern—which still remains with us. The expressive or evocative or suggestive realism which he in a sense introduced into the conventional theatres of our time has not yet run its course. His new and truly unified dramatic form, his new and presentational theatre building, his new and communal art of the future we have largely passed over or have found 'impractical.' But the relatively simplified and expressive and essentially anti-natural stagecraft and lighting, of which he was an early advocate and indeed practitioner, we have continued to develop (some would say exploit) through our present decade. As late as 1932, Lee Simonson believed that Appia's theories had elucidated the basic aesthetic principles of modern stage design, analyzed its fundamental technical problems, and outlined their solution; and that scene-designers still practice under 'the charter of freedom' which these theories formed.[21] Others, before this date and especially since, have complained that we have retained the outer trappings of Appia's vision but have lost or forgotten its inner essence; but none has yet found, after fifty years, a 'newer' new theatre and stagecraft that is likely to take the place of the one we now know so well.

Norman Bel Geddes, Mordecai Gorelik, Robert Edmond Jones, Jo Mielziner, Donald Oenslager, and Lee Simonson are certainly, each in his own way, representative contemporary designers. Roughly speaking, their work has spanned the last two decades, and more; for each of them, a dozen or more designs, as sketches or production photographs, are recorded in the files of *Theatre Arts* alone and are thus readily available for the average reader. The range of intention and accomplishment represented here is tremendous; the imagination, the skill, and the validity in terms of the script itself are notable indeed. The Geddes 'Dead End'[22]—like Harry Horner's set for 'The World We Make' and Howard Bay's for 'Brooklyn, U. S. A.'[23]—is what has been called hyper-realistic, just as the script demands. The same designer's settings for 'Hamlet' and 'The Eternal Road'[24] are of course poles apart from his work for the Sidney Kingsley play. Essentially presentational and conventionalized rather than illusory, they obviously rise above the merely normal—as in these instances the scripts allow. Other readily available contemporary designs[25] show a similar range, not only as to aesthetic style or form, but as to period style or form and as to individualized treatment or approach on the part of the designer. But few artists have consistently broken through the pattern of suggestive and evocative realism which now seems typical of our time; and, except in isolated and hardly

[21] *The Stage Is Set*, 352.

[22] *Theatre Arts* 19.889 and 20.125.

[23] *Theatre Arts* 24.2; *Theatre Arts* 26.90.

[24] *Theatre Arts* 15.889 and 988; 16.9-12; 21.180.

[25] Almost one hundred designs or projects by Geddes, Gorelik, Mielziner, Oenslager, and Simonson have been reproduced in *Theatre Arts* over the years, the following of which can be cited as typical in conception and scope: Geddes, 'Dead End,' 'Hamlet,' and 'The Eternal Road,' cited above; Gorelik, 'Uncle Moses' (*Theatre Arts* 15.100), 'Men in White' (17.911; 18.214-8), and 'Thunder Rock' (24.17); Mielziner, 'Biography' (17.114), 'High Tor' (21. 113-4), and 'Yellow Jack' (25.127); Oenslager, 'Emporer Jones' (16.607-8), 'Ten Million Ghosts' (20.934), and 'Pygmalion' (30. January cover); Simonson, 'School for Husbands' (17.953), 'Idiot's Delight' (23.36), and 'Marco Millions' (25. 124). Of Robert Edmond Jones and his designs, more in a later section.

representative instances, none has been able to follow up the fundamental and perhaps revolutionary changes which Appia foresaw in the theatre in general and in stage-mounting in particular.

In the fifth decade of the century, our new theatre is still non-naturalistic. Wherever the scripts allow such latitude, our typical settings are suggestive and simple and not loaded down with the impedimenta of Appia's time; they are occasionally formalized to expressive as well as practical theatrical ends, and they even now show occasional signs of a sort of latter-day stylization carried over from the forepart of the century; they are lighted beautifully, effectively, and plastically on a technical basis and with an aesthetic effect which Appia in some measure predicted. In our own way and to our own degree, we followed Appia in the 1920's and we follow him now. How far our own way and our own degree have gone in reaching the heart of Appia's conception may well be quite another matter.

ASPECTS OF THE BROADWAY THEATRE

John Gassner

THE grim reaper has been working overtime on Broadway, and play after play has fallen under his scythe. Even Kaufman and Ferber, Connelly, Van Druten, Dorothy Heyward, and Garson Kanin have seen their respective plays 'Bravo,' 'Story for Strangers,' 'Make Way For Lucia,' 'Set My People Free,' and 'Smile of the World' go under; and Tennessee Williams lost an encounter on Broadway for the first time when 'Summer and Smoke' lasted only until it exhausted pre-arranged theatre-parties. Only one new playwright, Robert McEnroe, won a victory with 'The Silver Whistle.' Broadway's doldrums have been particularly acute this season, which has been thus far the poorest in many years. Only five plays—'Life With Mother,' 'Light up the Sky,' 'Goodbye, My Fancy,' 'The Silver Whistle,' and 'Anne of the Thousand Days'—are flourishing at present; and of these, only the last three give indications of fresh creation. Musical entertainment has consisted of several unremarkable revues and musical comedies, a musical treatment of 'Charlie's Aunt' ('Where's Charlie?') in which Ray Bolger triumphs over poor matter, a very good musicalization of 'The Taming of the Shrew' ('Kiss Me, Kate'), and one significant, if less than triumphant, experiment—Kurt Weill's chronicle-demonstration, 'Love Life.' England and the European continent continued to export their most marketable plays, but the most successful of them, 'Edward, My Son' and 'Red Gloves'—the American adaptation of Sartre's 'Les Mains Sales'—have been actors' triumphs for Robert Morley and Charles Boyer. Tallulah Bankhead makes 'Private Lives' her private football.

The season has been, nevertheless, rich in provocations to questions of some consequence. 'Summer and Smoke' calls attention to Tennessee Williams' problems as a playwright and 'Anne of the Thousand Days' to the value of Maxwell Anderson's exploration of the field of poetic drama, while other plays raise thoughts concerning such matters as the possibilities in fantasy and social drama. Little can be done by Broadway to alter the economic conditions that blast its enterprise; and it is increasingly plain that while these prevail, certain noble ventures—'The Rape of Lucretia' is an example —are bound to be impractical. But it is apparent that even under prevailing circumstances some plays succeed, that other plays could succeed if more skill went into their making, and that new directions properly explored may lead to interesting results.

1

In 'Anne of the Thousand Days,' Maxwell Anderson has written another historical romance set in Elizabethan times, completing what may be considered an Elizabethan trilogy with 'Elizabeth the Queen' and 'Mary of Scotland.' In the context of a trilogy, 'Anne' would have to stand first since it deals with the

JOHN GASSNER *is Chairman of the Departments of Playwriting and the History of the Theatre at the New School for Social Research and is also Dramatic Critic for* The Forum. *He has taught at Hunter College, Bryn Mawr, and Northwestern, and is the author of several books on the theatre.* *In this article Mr. Gassner resumes the survey of the Broadway Theatre begun in the April and October issues of 1948. This report considers the 1948-49 season to about January 15.*

drama of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn, mother of Elizabeth. Anne, in Mr. Anderson's exegesis, goes to her death rather than jeopardize her daughter's claims to the succession. Mr. Anderson has delivered himself of turbulent drama, which is essentially a sex duel within a political framework. Full-bodied and complex characters, recognizable to an Elizabethan audience, people his stage, and their passions could have been enacted in the Globe Theatre itself. Anderson has written a free, multi-scened chronicle, has telescoped events with Elizabethan abandon, and has employed soliloquies in order to get into Henry's and Anne's minds. The writing is singularly lean for an Anderson verse drama, and it is spiced with the lusty humor for which the playwright has had a penchant ever since 'What Price Glory?' With the help of brilliant, if not always optimal, performances (Rex Harrison and Joyce Redman, are the principals, and Percy Waram makes a superb Wolsey), 'Anne of the Thousand Days' is striking theatre. The unit setting, it is true, would be excelled in any first-rate university production. It is a hastily designed affair since the original revolving stage settings caused mechanical difficulties and had to be scrapped. But the unit set does not impede the action, even if it lacks character.

The play is high-grade theatre since it is literate and touches upon the complexities of both human nature and politics. It relates the two credibly and intensely, and attains a larger frame of reference in scenes of conflict between private conscience and Tudor absolutism. The scenes that present Bishop Fisher and Thomas More as opposing Henry's assumption of religious authority and the trumpery trial of Anne are as moving as the personal relations of the King and Anne. Mr. Anderson's antipathy for roughshod politics in any form has an authentic ring, and its reverberations enter the contemporary world of totalitarian tyranny, although the play, which is fortunately free from preachment, makes all its points in terms of the immediate action and the characters' response to it. The author's view of history (and a measure of Maxwell Anderson's standing in our theatre is the fact that he is one of the few American playwrights who have a sense of history) is hardly profound and is tinged with romaticism. There is much of Carlyle in Anderson's historical approach (though without Carlyle's thrasonical hero worship) which reminds us somewhat of Pascal's notion that the world would have been different if Cleopatra's nose had been shorter. The whole history of the world, up to the last military operation in the Greek hills or the Palestinian area, might have followed a different course but for Henry's libido. This is a great deal to attach to one stormy private affair and staggers the imagination too much to occur to the average playgoer as he watches the production. Nor does the playwright insist on our completing the historical circuit in the playhouse,—it is sufficient for practical purposes that the play may convey a suggestion of momentousness. Anderson also sagely indicates that Henry himself is not sure but that his instinct may be on the side of history, that he may be instinctively expressing the desires of the English people while indulging his own. More is involved in this view, since it touches on the interplay of personality and historical conditions, than either Mr. Anderson or his critics can explore in the theatre. It figures less as a philosophy of history than as a characterizing detail and it lessens romantic naïveté in the play, even if it does so at the cost of a little fuzzi-

ness. The one other respect in which the play seems hazy, Anne's own immorality, may stem less from the writing than the production. The personality of the petite Joyce Redman and the direction she has received give a rather Victorian impression of Anne as a heroine more sinned against than sinning, as a lady more pure of heart than both history and Anderson's early scenes would warrant. The play in production, and perhaps also in text, would have a more modern ring (and would also be more Elizabethan and less romantic *à la* Schiller, Hugo, et al.) if Anne had more upstart devil than fallen angel in her. From a box-office point of view, of course, this does not matter since for all its vaunted modernity the general public responds more generously to a virtuous or nearly virtuous heroine. Scratch any middle-class audience at any time, I suspect, and you will find a Victorian heart.

Seen in perspective, even so competently created and successful a play is an event of minor consequence. In subject matter, dramatic technique, and style it harks back to the English Theatre's vanished greatness instead of setting the stage on a contemporary foundation. Anderson is epigeous; his poetic drama is a plant deliberately nourished in the hothouse of Broadway instead of a fruit-bearing tree that has pushed its way up through native soil. One test would be whether a play gives the impression of being wrung from American experience instead of being imposed upon us as a topsoil layer of culture. Genuine culture is somewhat gritty and acquires a polished surface only after many feet have worn it smooth. One of our errors has often been to think that culture is something to be added rather than grown, although the opposite view has been trumpeted through the land ever since Emerson had his say. Since Anderson compounds the error in most of his poetic dramas, we owe him less than his talent would otherwise warrant; and we must still wait for someone to give as large a measure of vitality to the American theatre as O'Neill did in the early 1920's. For that matter, the theatre has been vitalized, if not to any degree of world importance, by the late Sidney Howard, Paul Green, George Kelly, Odets, Saroyan, and E. P. Conkle.

The youngest writer from whom American drama seems to emanate as a natural flow of energy has been Tennessee Williams, and it is therefore regrettable that 'Summer and Smoke' did not come up to the high expectations that had been entertained for it. The regret is made all the more poignant by the impression that it could have been the culmination of its author's efforts to date. For this reason it is not really important to observe that Williams was repeating himself, that the theme again involved the subject of frustration in the Williams-Faulkner South, and that the heroine is a younger sister of 'Streetcar's' Blanche du Bois. It is possible, at least I should like us to entertain the hypothesis, that 'Summer and Smoke' could have been a major work if, taking his cue from O'Neill, its author had dared to write, and if a producer had dared to present, a considerably longer play.

The truth is that Williams, eschewing sensational elements such as abound in 'Streetcar' and concerned with the long chain of cause and effect in a human chronicle (whereas both 'Streetcar' and 'The Glass Menagerie' present only effects of immediate, dramatized events), has written a novelistic drama. Starting with an episode in the childhood of his characters and unreeling their separate and entangled fates to a conclusion in which the hero finds orientation and

the heroine only disorientation, 'Summer and Smoke' comes close in contour to 'Strange Interlude,' in which it is the woman who achieves orientation after her life's fitful fever. The well bred and idealistic girl, whom we first see at the base of the statue of Eternity in the town square, irks the vital boy she favors. As they grow up, his breezy courting and her shrinking from normal masculine carnality cause them to drift apart, although she remains deeply attached to him. She stagnates in her ministerial home with a neurotic mother who is a cross to both father and daughter, and makes a pathetic effort to find compensations in a grotesquely inept local literary club. In the meantime the young man, who has become a physician and his father's assistant, continues to be driven by the flesh as well as by a bedevilling restlessness undefined by the author. Going from bad to worse, he defiantly plays the cynic and philanderer, and becomes embroiled with an exotic daughter of sin and her disreputable father. He is ready to marry her when the old doctor tries to stop the misalliance and is killed in a quarrel with the tart's father. The young man succumbs to desperation, and it is at this point that his ways are altered by his delicate girl friend. Roused by her words, he goes away to do research in a metropolitan medical center and returns, after a prolonged stay, a hero of science and a local celebrity. Grateful to her but viewing her now in the ideal or spiritual light in which she had wanted to be regarded, he puts her on a pedestal. But it is to another person, to a worshiping and undemanding young girl, that he turns for marriage. The cruel irony of it is that the heroine, her 'spirituality' gone with the wasted years, can no longer be satisfied with ideal friendship, and the result is traumatic for her. The last scene shows her desperately attracting a traveling salesman under the shadow of the same statute of Eternity where we first saw her as a starry-eyed schoolgirl. I submit that this is an engrossing story, a drama pervaded by genuine experience.

The play has, moreover, an authenticity and a freedom from sensationalism, as well as from specialness, that owing to Stan's brutality and Blanche's condition was less evident in 'Streetcar.' In this respect it is an advance over 'Streetcar,' as only Brooks Atkinson, I believe, had the astuteness to discover. The reason why 'Summer and Smoke' does not materialize altogether successfully on the stage is that, in spite of some masterful scenes at the end, it has the configuration of a novel with interspersed and climatic episodes of drama. I have referred to it elsewhere as comparable to a script in which some complete scenes are set in a matrix of summary. As a result, the play gives the impression of lagging a good deal and then suddenly flaring up into a situation not always inevitable—as if now and then the author decided to provide something exciting for the public even at the cost of appearing to contrive the situation. A case in point is the scene in which the old doctor is killed. An example of something that seems to be drawn out of the dramatist's hat rather than out of the experience of the play is the hero's return as a medical success and benefactor of mankind. Even the reversal whereby the heroine craves carnal love and the hero offers her only spiritual comradeship seems prescribed rather than inevitable. All these dramatic humps could have been smoothed down if the playwright had realized the novelistic quality of his matter and given it more scope in a longer play.

Even in the present shape it is possi-

ble that the play could have emerged more effectively if it had been better directed and set. Not all of the acting had vibrancy, and even the highly praised principals needed better direction. The young doctor projected a rather neutral personality into a role which requires extremely high spirits. Although Margaret Phillips turned in one of the best performances in recent seasons, she was allowed to nurse a nervous giggle throughout the play instead of reserving it for climaxes. It is also debatable whether she should not have exhibited more vivacity in early scenes in order to preclude the assumption that she is already neurotic in her young womanhood. Better pace and sharper definition, such as we have found in Elia Kazan's direction of 'Streetcar,' would have reduced the levelness and quiescence of the first half of the performance. Nor would it appear that the Mielziner setting, properly lauded for its beauty and suggestiveness but overrated so far as utility goes, actually helped the production. The stage was permanently divided into two alternately lit small sections, at the right and left, to establish the respective homes of the principals, and the town square with the statue of Eternity was set between the two areas on a higher level. Since most of the scenes are placed in the two homes, the greater part of the story was played in cramped areas away from center. Even 'Strange Interlude' with the remarkable cast of twenty years ago, would have suffered from staging which relegated key situations to such quarters. It might have been better to play without scenery at all or in successively set scenes against a permanent ramp and statue. It is easy to understand how when Mr. Atkinson saw the play on Margo Jone's arena stage in Dallas it had an aura for him which has not appreciably left it in his eyes since then.

Whatever the reasons, the failure of 'Summer and Smoke' to rise to its potentialities is not merely just another altogether too familiar incident on Broadway because Broadway has badly needed another triumph from Mr. Williams. His work is in the American grain, and it moves in the direction of transcending realism rather than avoiding it. It is probably the one direction from which progress in American playwriting may be expected.

2

Another path which current drama has followed may be described as 'comedy of liberalism.' 'State of the Union' and 'Born Yesterday' have represented it in recent seasons, and Fay Kanin's 'Goodbye, My Fancy' continues the vogue successfully. In comedy it has been possible to express social criticism that does not challenge our foundations but seeks to strengthen them along traditional democratic lines. This may lend support to the theory that the best condition for comedy is the existence of tradition, even if it does not support the allied opinion that the comedy can be written only when a stable society provides the background and provocation. (The opposite conclusion might well have been drawn from John Van Druten's dramatization of the Benson stories, 'Make Way for Lucia,' in which the society was so disgustingly stable as to be deadly dull even in a well directed Theatre Guild production!) In any case, 'Goodbye, My Fancy,' which jibes rather cleverly at the hide-bound trustees and the pusillanimous president of a woman's college and does so within the framework of a romatic story, provides viable entertainment on the level of social consciousness. Well directed by Sam Wanamaker and vigorously played by himself, by the entrancing Madeleine Carroll, and by that perennial incarnation of the 'dry mock'

Miss Shirley Booth, 'Goodbye, My Fancy' is likely to enliven the rest of the season. The play will, no doubt, find its way ultimately into most areas of the non-professional theatre, where it is unlikely to offend even conservative sensibilities. It pleads for nothing more than the right of young people to receive information instead of being insulated from the world (as if they could be!), and it notes only the danger of middle-aged flabbiness. The method by which the heroine, an extravagantly glorified Congresswoman and ex-reporter, shakes the college president out of his lethargy may be politely described as blackmail and is a dubious expedient in a play dedicated to honorable conduct. The actual results, the showing of a war document to the student body, also seems too temporary to be conclusive since the Congresswoman decides against marrying the president and will not be around to jog him when he confronts any other issue. The play is not altogether sound in other respects as well, but it wins a willing suspension of disbelief with its charm.

This suspension is amply stretched in the case of 'Edward, My Son,' which came to these shores after two profitable years in London and brought Robert Morley and Peggy Ashcroft with it. The latter delivered the better—that is, the more genuine—acting in the role of a long-suffering woman who watches her husband's steady ascent toward success and iniquity. But Robert Morley turns handsprings in the role of the husband to such effect that one watches the play for the sheer virtuosity of his performance. Perfect in timing and precise in mien, he runs the gamut of the mime's art, pulling out trick after trick in the role of bankrupt, arsonist, business tycoon, unfaithful husband, and aged fox. One may feel that one has been put upon by 'Edward, My Son,' of which Morley is also co-author, because the play fiddles harmonics on the strings of a 'humour' —namely a hypertrophied paternal instinct which is, of course, little more than the projection of an egregious ego. One plays a sort of game with the actor, who extends the invitation to do so by stepping out in front of the curtain twice or three times to address the public in his role. This procedure may be kissing cousin to a wink, but it is a wink with an elegance of which only British repertory trained actors seem to be capable. The professionalism displayed in 'Edward, My Son' almost convinces us that we are watching a social and psychological drama instead of a theatrical soufflé served up with British sangfroid and with impeccable manners.

We have, of course, trickery of our own that works now and then, as in both 'Life With Mother' and 'Light Up the Sky.' In the case of the former, the word ought perhaps be changed to witchery since Dorothy Stickney is once more nonplussing Father Day in her inimitable manner. But the jest is worn rather thin as Mrs. Day covets and acquires her long delayed engagement ring. In spite of some pleasant additions to the Day saga, 'Life With Mother' succeeds chiefly because the production is so skillful and because the Howard Lindsay and Russell Crouse team knows its way around a contrivance. Moss Hart, who shows the same expertness in 'Light Up the Sky,' has the knack of keeping a tired plot jogging whenever it is about ready to lie down and give up the ghost. His actual intention appears to have been to write a realistic account of how a play is born, slain, and resuscitated during a pre-Broadway tryout tour. When the serious element, which included an exposé of Broadway art, jeopardized the success of the play, Mr.

Hart, acting in the dual capacity of author and director, went about saving its body by abbreviating its spirit. He succeeded, and the humor of 'Light Up the Sky' ticks away merrily in a mechanical heart.

3

Sturdier drama has also appeared on the stage in three plays from the European continent, which has been more provoked to plough the field of social and political life than we have been. The most original of the trio, 'The Madwoman of Chaillot,' is a whimsical fantasy. An eccentric Countess resolves to rid Paris of the entire breed of capitalistic promoters. She does so with the approval of cronies even more eccentric than herself and with the aid of a philosophical ragpicker and of 'the king of the Paris sewers.' Luring the offenders into a subterranean passage by playing upon their greed, she closes a trap door on them, and the disappearance of the corrupters of life ushers in a new age of brotherhood and bliss. This, with the addition of a small romance, is the fable which is unfolded with rueful and satiric extravagance.

The play is arresting in spite of considerable lagging and of incomplete realization, which is due mostly to the staging but partly perhaps to translation. The production had two sets, one charmingly skeletonized and the other rather naturalistic, whereas a single playful style for both settings would have given more buoyancy as well as unity. The lighting in the second half of the play was crepuscular, which was justified on naturalistic grounds since the locale is a cellar room. But the matter is comic in a variety of tones ranging from an Alice-in-Wonderland madness to millenial lyricism, and the dim lighting detracted measurably from the gaiety and buoyancy of the content. How much penetration and challenge there is in a piece like 'The Madwoman of Chaillot' is also open to some debate; it would certainly be a mistake to consider it revolutionary. The politically conservative author's protest has the effect of an aristocrat favoring the *Lumpenproletariat*, despising business enterprise, and playing the old romantic game of *'épater le bourgeoisie.'*

Since, unlike Giraudoux, Sartre has had experience with real revolutionary activity, his approach to a social problem is decidedly less fanciful. 'Les Mains Sales' concerns the psychology of a revolutionary convert from the upper class, the opportunism of political strategy, and the shifting party lines of Communism which make the same man a class hero one day and a class traitor another day, or vice versa. The young convert undertakes a difficult assignment of political assassination in order to prove his loyalty to the cause. The man who is to be removed is none other than a top party leader who is trying to arrange a coalition government. The young man finds himself incapable of assassinating a man he has come to admire as a human being, even while still regarding him as politically in the wrong. He has just about renounced his mission when, believing his wife to be unfaithful to him with the leader, he kills the latter. When the fictive Balkan kingdom in which the action is set cracks up, he is released from prison. But the party's policy has changed in favor of a coalition government and to promote the new policy it must glorify the murdered leader who had originally sponsored it. The youth must therefore either disavow his act or be 'liquidated.' Since, as he reveals to a woman comrade, his act had really been a *crime passionél* it would be easy for him to save his life. But because he still opposes a coalition,

he prefers death to besmirching the purity of the act which he had been ordered to perform. An 'existentialist' hero, he remains true to his conception of what would have been the right course for his conscience, even though he did not follow it originally when he killed out of jealousy .

We are less inclined toward such lines of complicated reasoning as the French affect, just as we also prefer less philosophy in plays; but the situation contains matter for an engrossing political drama, a form of writing which may become more and more important and is capable of yielding interesting results. It has already yielded them in the field of fiction, as we have seen in the novels of Malraux and Koestler—especially the latter's noteworthy *Darkness at Noon*. (Koestler, it may be of some interest to note here, also wrote a highly original, if overly hypothetical, political play 'Twilight Bar.') It is, therefore, unfortunate that the American adaptation under the ridiculous title of 'Red Gloves' and the faulty Jed Harris production have made the play look quite absurd, even if a remarkable portrait of the Communist leader does emerge in the acting of Charles Boyer. The young assassin is portrayed with incredible ineptness, his wife lacks credibility, and the adaptation compounds the felony by making the Boyer leader instead of the tragically divided youth the central character.[1] If Sartre himself is responsible for the Graustarkian element in the play, French Graustarkism is not quite the same commodity that we associate with the label. It has roots in an attitude far more sophisticated and supercilious than does the American brand, and it cannot perhaps be rightly conveyed to us.

[1] Anyone interested in the argument over the adaptation may be referred to the article Red Gloves and Dirty Hands by Leo Sauvage in a December 1948 issue of *The Nation*.

'The Victors,' better staged and faithfully adapted by Wilder, presents a somewhat simpler problem for international understanding, since it is on the surface a taut melodrama about a group of Resistance members who defy torture and death rather than betray their leader. But it follows the same tortuous paths of motivation, self-examination, and philosophical exploration of the question of integrity as Sartre's other play. I doubt whether even those who are moved by 'The Victors,' as I was, can follow it comfortably and completely. Most of us in America are blessedly naive in matters of mental self-excruciation and have been largely spared the political irritations that turn such lucubrations into real experience. Moreover, the scenes of torture and murder which present in a blistering light, not only the fortitude of the victims but the painful sadism of the torturers require a stronger stomach than most of our playgoers have. (It is remarkable what cast-iron stomachs refined Europeans have!) But for all this, the limited run of 'The Victors' added fibre to a flabby season.

It is significant, too, that the only musical plays on Broadway with any real toughness of spirit have been thus far the British opera 'The Rape of Lucretia,' the high points of which are the infamous death of Tarquinius and the suicide of Lucretia, both presented with cool objectivity that may pass for classicism; and 'Love Life' which has a book and lyrics by Lerner, the librettist of 'Brigadoon,' but takes its character from Kurt Weill's music. Kurt Weill is the composer of the famous left-wing German version of 'The Beggar's Opera,' 'Die Dreigroschenoper' or 'Three-Penny Opera.' Analytical, hortatory, and satiric, 'Love Life' is an economic chronicle of marriage in America—acute and arrestingly angular but not engaging and

blithe like the good Cole Porter show 'Kiss Me Kate.'

The Wienerwald and rose-cavalier spirit has suffered considerable erosion under the long historical weather since 1914. (It also masked a good deal of sharpness before the first World War!) The inclemencies of history have had their effect in Europe. More jagged glacial and rock formations now just out from the European soul than our good nature permits us to notice. And, as is often the case, art reveals what even good journalism misses.

A parallel case is perhaps provided by the fact that our most trenchant explorations of suffering or evil (as shown by Faulkner and Tennessee Williams) come from the South, a region to which history has also been unkind. Yet a Southern historical drama like Dorothy Heyward's 'Set My People Free,' which dramatizes an early slave rebellion in Charleston, is gentle and forebearing in comparison with the ironic, essentially hard treatment it would have received from, let us say, Sartre. Miss Heyward's play regarded with equal sympathy the Negro who wanted to massacre the whites and the Negro who wanted to save his master. The emotional effect was marked but the viewpoint was made murky by the divided approach to the story, and the edge of the dramatic material was blunted. The Theatre Guild's production included such forceful actors as Juan Fernandez and Canada Lee. Yet the staging was almost placid. For really strong political and social writing our stage has lacked animus and and intellectual intensity. The latter we have never had except possibly in O'Neill's wrestlings with the universe, and in them there was always more heat than light. Of animus or intensely partisan feeling we had examples during the irritated depression period in Group Theatre and Theatre Union plays like 'Stevedore' and 'Waiting for Lefty.' The combination of animus and intellectual bite that has appeared for instance, in Strindberg, Sternheim, Wedekind, Giradoux, Camus, Sartre, and Brecht has remained a transatlantic formula. I am not at all sure that this needs to be regretted when we consider the probable price we should have had to pay to possess it. But it has produced singular dramatic work, much of it less familiar to most of us than it should be, much of it certainly less appealing to Americans than European-oriented critics are prepared to understand.[2]

[2] Two plays I have not dealt with in the body of this article are 'The Silver Whistle,' a Theatre Guild success in which Jose Ferrer excels; and 'Minnie and Mr. Williams,' a failure, for which the present writer was responsible as the producer. 'The Silver Whistle,' a pleasant tale of a tramp's success in bringing happiness into an old people's home, touches upon the saving importance of illusions. Characteristically for an American production, it presents a viewpoint the very opposite of the one maintained in Gorky's 'The Lower Depths.' The play takes a congenial view of the world, and is properly rewarded for it. It will doubtless become a perennial for the non-professional and summer theatres. 'Minnie and Mr. Williams,' an adaptation of Richard Hughes' 'Comedy of Good and Evil' which must be familiar to readers of this journal, enjoyed the services of Josephine Hu', Eddie Dowling, and Clarence Derwent. For the present report it is sufficient to state that the play required a stylization for which stage direction in America has scant aptitude, and the play itself, an ironic fantasy on the janus-faced character of good and evil, proved too metaphysical for popularity. The production of such a play on Broadway may be ruefully set down as a quixotic skirmish with the commercial theatre by a teacher and critic.

'UP WITH WHICH WE CAN NO LONGER PUT'

R. W. Pence

A GOODLY number of educated people would be willing to stake their lives on four matters of English usage, no one of which has much basis in fact! They know positively that it is a gross grammatical error to end a sentence with a preposition; to split an infinitive; to begin a sentence with *and, but,* or *for;* and to use the pronoun *that* in referring to a human being. These questionable and relatively unimportant rules are made the very cornerstones of usage.

Yet it is these same people who often do not know the difference between a preposition and an adverb placed at the end of a statement. They do not know, when pinned down, precisely what a split infiinitive is. They have never heard of the difference between *and* used as a conjunction and *and* used as a transitional adverb. And they are likewise ignorant of the fact that there are three different kinds of *that's.*

We shall have time to glance briefly at only the first of these false assumptions—namely, that it is a grammatical sin to end a statement with a preposition.[1]

It is a commonplace that written discourse and spoken discourse differ greatly at times. Vocabulary, sentence length, and the grammatical and rhetorical sentence patterns of the one often vary greatly from those of the other. But the fundamental difference between the two is the fact that, whereas written discourse is the subject of both prevision and revision, spoken discourse is to some degree the subject of neither. In writing one can look ahead and plan his sentence before he begins; after he has written it he can go back and revise and rewrite it as often as his judgment dictates. But in spoken discourse one often starts uttering a sentence without foreseeing its final grammatical or rhetorical pattern; and once uttered, the sentence has to stand without revision. Conversation, for instance, would be very tiresome if one thought out a sentence to the end before beginning to speak and then insisted on revising it at will and re-uttering it!

This inability to think out one's sentences first, or to go back and revise them after they have been spoken, results at times in incoherence—sometimes in the sort of bewildering incoherence exemplified by an attractive young lady in a recent story who upon meeting a Dr. Briggs says:

> At the office we know another Dr. Briggs, a man we got to land his business or get transferred back to Weston. It would be funny if you and him was related. He's head of the Humana Drug Chain and has opium dreams. Me and Bill Dusek work at Buttercup Dairies, and I'm here for manure, which I saw in the paper, but Bill couldn't come.

In spoken discourse it is often perfectly natural for a preposition to come at the end of a statement. In fact, to place the preposition elsewhere would often result in a stilted, awkward style. The statement 'Smith is the man I saw you with' is certainly to be preferred to Smith is the man with whom I saw you.'

R. W. PENCE *is Professor of English at DePauw University. He is the author of* A Grammar of Present-Day English (Macmillan, New York, 1947).

[1] Of course, ending a sentence with a preposition is not the concern of grammar at all. It is a matter of rhetoric, which deals with the less desirable and more desirable ways of expressing thought.

Likewise, 'I know the man your sister is engaged to' is far more natural than 'I know the man to whom your sister is engaged.' And certainly few people say spontaneously, 'She is the girl with whom my brother is now going.' To avoid ending a statement with a preposition in such instances would result in the kind of prissy, schoolmarm diction seen in the last example.

Further, there are many situations in which the preposition has to come, willy-nilly, at the end. When a preposition in a passive construction has been 'retained' from the active construction there is no place for the preposition except the end of the sentence. In 'I was laughed at' or 'I was made fun of' (*at* retained from the active 'They laughed at me'; *of* retained from the active 'They made fun of me') even the pedantic purist would have a difficult time trying to place the preposition elsewhere than at the end.

Prepositions are often confused with adverbs. In such a statement as 'The old building had to be torn down,' *down* is an adverb, not a preposition. In the active construction 'They had to tear down the old building,' *down* is not a preposition governing the building; it is an adverb modifying the verb; and *building* is the object of the verb *tear* (or, if one prefers, of *tear* + *down*). Similarly *off*, *up*, and *out* are adverbs, not prepositions, in 'The meeting has been put off,' 'He will have to settle up,' 'The fire has been put out.'

In written discourse, we have a different situation. Of course the end of a sentence is the most emphatic position. We know that a preposition is, by its very nature, a weak part of speech. Inasmuch as I may plan my sentence before I write it or go back and revise and rewrite it as often as I please, there is no excuse for my wasting the most emphatic place in the sentence on as weak a word as a preposition. It is a simple matter to move the preposition to a position earlier in the sentence where it can stand before the substantive that it governs. Instead of writing 'He is a man that we can have no liking at all for,' I can revise my sentence so that it is a much better one and just as natural—'He is a man for whom we can have no liking at all.' Even in written discourse *naturalness* should govern the word order. No one would care to be responsible for such an awkward avoidance of a preposition at the end of a sentence as 'That is something up with which we can no longer put.'

An actual grammatical problem does arise in spoken discourse when a question opens with an interrogative pronoun. Since the preposition which turns out to govern the opening substantive in such a sentence as 'Who are you looking for?' is spoken only after the sentence has already been uttered with the nominative *who* usually demanded by the initial position, the framer of the sentence does not discover until he reaches the end that the terminal preposition actually governs the introductory interrogative and that, therefore, he should have started with the objective *whom* and not the nominative *who*. But the discovery comes too late. We have similar instances in 'Who are you thinking of?' 'Who is your letter from?' 'I wonder who she is waiting for.' What is the speaker to do in such situations? Is he to go back and recast his sentence and re-utter it in some such fashion as—'Who are you thinking of? - er - er - I mean, Whom are you thinking of?'

With the average person prevision is out of the question. Rare is he who would anticipate what turns out eventually to be a grammatical demand for the objective case; for this would mean that before he started to speak he would have

to know that the sentence would end with a preposition which was to govern the introductory interrogative pronoun. And, further, revision of the statement after it has once been uttered would certainly be most undesirable. No wonder, then, that certain radical students of grammar are now insisting that in *spoken* discourse we must accept as correct usage the nominative when a terminal preposition turns out to govern the initial interrogative pronoun.[2]

But in written discourse, there is probably no good excuse for the use of the nominative case when grammar demands the objective. We may insist that in ordinary written discourse we write 'Whom are you thinking of?' 'Whom is your letter from?' 'I wonder whom she is waiting for.'

To sum up, then, there is nothing wrong *grammatically* with ending a sentence with a preposition. Needlessly ending a sentence with a preposition may be a matter of rhetoric—a matter of sacrificing a useful emphasis at the end of a sentence. There are instances when a sentence must end with a preposition as we have seen. In some cases what has been thought a preposition at the end of a statement is not a preposition at all but an adverb. But in spoken discourse a very real problem does arise when a terminal preposition turns out to govern an initial interrogative pronoun. Today a person who uses a natural nominative, instead of the technically demanded objective case, for the initial interrogative pronoun probably will not be put in jail for his literary offense. If he be threatened with punishment he can now call upon a goodly number of trained linguists who will ably—and often with a vast amount of enthusiasm—defend him.

If one has to choose between naturalness and an affected correctness in either written or spoken discourse, certainly he should choose naturalness at all costs. If this means, especially in spoken discourse, ending any sentence naturally with a preposition, so be it. If this means at times cutting across a principle of grammar, again so be it.

[2] The overly cautious might insist that in this very dilemma he has a compelling reason for never ending any sentence with a preposition. Such a person would seem to reason that man was made for language instead of language being made for man.

A CHILD'S LEARNING OF NUMERALS

W. F. Leopold

THE learning of numerals serves well to illustrate the difficulties which children have to overcome in imitating the words and meanings of the standard language. Many observers have paid attention to it.[1] This paper will add my own observations of my daughter Hildegard's language learning.[2] Since the child was exposed to English and German at the same time, her learning was complicated by the acquisition of two sets of phonetic words for the expression of numerical concepts. In the initial stage, the child tried to forge a single language instrument from the twofold presentation, later separating the two languages from each other. This situation is reflected in the numerals as well as in other language areas.

Children usually learn to count early, but that does not mean that they master the meaning of numerals. Abstracts, even those of a low order, are difficult for children because their learning requires a certain degree of intellectual maturity. Numerals differ from other abstracts in having a precise meaning. It is this logical precision which makes their learning difficult for the immature small child. The vagueness which other abstracts have in the standard languages corresponds better to the semantic vagueness which is characteristic of small children's speech.

A clear distinction must be made between numerals as isolated vocabulary items; sets of numerals in a conventional order imitated in mechanical phonetic reproduction without a clear meaning; counting for the purpose of enumerating objects or acts; and intelligent use of numbers with their standard logical meanings. The latter use, of which we think primarily when we speak of numerals, is nothing but an abridged counting; but the abridgement is the difficulty which small children cannot overcome except for the lowest numbers.

Hildegard's first preliminary exercise for counting was observed at 1;8.[3] She

W. F. LEOPOLD *is Professor of Grammar and Linguistics at Northwestern University. He is the author of* Speech Development of a Bilingual Child, *in four volumes published in the Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities.*

[1] For other observations concerning the learning of numerals, cf., e.g., Otto Jespersen, *Language* (London, 1922, New York, [1923]) 119ff. (good comments on the learning of his son); S. R. A. Court, Numbers, Time, and Space in the First Five Years of a Child's Life, *Pedagogical Seminary* 27 (1920).71-89; Bernard Perez, Le Développement des idées abstraites chez l'enfant, *Revue philosophique* 40 (1895).459ff.; Hanna Neugebauer, Aus der Sprachentwicklung meines Sohnes, *Zeitschrift für angewandte Psychologie* 9 (1915).301-6; H. Beckmann, Die Entwicklung der Zahlleistung bei zwei- bis sechsjährigen Kindern, same journal 22 (1923).1-72; W. Preyer, *Die Seele des Kindes*, (Leipzig, 1882, eighth ed. 1912); *The mind of the child* vol. 2. (New York, 1890) 160, 165, 247; I. A. Ghergov. Ein Beitrag zur grammatischen Entwicklung der Kindersprache, *Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie* 11 (1908).282, 383ff. (also separately, Liepzig, 1908); M. M. Nice, The development of a child's vocabulary in relation to environment, *Pedagogical Seminary* 22 (1915).35-64 (no adequate idea of numbers beyond two until nearly age 4). The results of most of these studies are closely parallel to mine.

[2] Werner F. Leopold, *Speech development of a bilingual child: a linguist's record;* vol. 1, *Vocabulary growth in the first two years,* Evanston, 1939 (Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities, no. 6); vol. 2, *Sound-learning in the first two years,* Evanston, 1947 (same series no. 11); vol. 3, *Grammar and general problems in the first two years;* vol 4, *Diary from age two* (forthcoming in the same series). Vol. 2 was reviewed by H. B. Allen in QJS 33 (1947).394ff. The beginning of this article, as far as it deals with the second year, reproduces § 597 of the unpublished vol. 3. For the later years, section numbers of vol. 4 are added in the text for comparison after publication, presumably in 1949.

[3] At 1;8 means at the age of 1 year and 8 months.

owned three balls. Holding one, she asked in German 'mehr Ball' ('more ball', 'Give me another ball'). Having received it, she repeated the same request. When she had her three balls together, she stopped asking. This seems to indicate that she knew how many balls there were. In other words, she had a functional concept 'three', although she did not yet dispose of a linguistic expression for it. This is surprising; for when she learned numerical words later, the numerical concepts lagged far behind the phonetic imitation.

About a week later, there was another instance of counting without the use of standard numerals, which confirmed the use of the word 'more' for the purpose of enumeration. She pointed to three lamps in the room in succession, saying 'Light—mehr light—mehr'. The example is more mature than the preceding one because the wish element was missing; it was a pure statement of fact. It is less mature in that the purpose was not necessarily that of establishing the total number of like objects; but the intention of enumerating like objects is unmistakable, and it took a long time until the same purpose was served by real numerals. The child was getting ready for counting, although it was not yet counting in developed form.

At 1;10 she learned to count with specific words, not however with the purpose of establishing the quantity of like objects, but as a signal for an impending action. When she was lifted down and the cue 'one' was given by an adult, she continued 'two, three'. When the cue was given in German, 'eins', she continued 'zwei, drei'. Later during the same month the two series were amalgamated into one. Upon the challenge, 'Count!', she would utter the fixed sequence 'Three, two, zwei, drei'. The initial numeral 'one' did not appear in the series because it had too often been the cue given by adults; 'eins' was said rarely. Less frequent hybrid sequences were 'zwei, drei, three' and 'three, drei, two'. Thus she used five standard numerals by the end of the second year; but they had no numerical meaning, and she did not reproduce the standard sequence. All that she had learned was that several of them were needed to give a signal for a sudden, dramatic action.

During the last month of the second year, however, the numerical concept 'two' began to develop. She had several cookies, and I asked her, in German, 'Give Papa two'. First she tried to give me only one, but then she added the second. Obviously she had no clear idea what 'zwei' meant; but the fact that I was not satisfied until she had given me two cookies contributed to the learning of the meaning of the word. Twice she gave a garbled expression of the concept 'two' herself: she referred to two shoes with 'three two shoes', and to two toy autos with 'three two auto.'

Thus the numerical meaning of 'one' was undeveloped; that of 'two' was beginning to become clearer; but 'three' was no more than a mechanical unit in a sequence, without any meaning and even without a fixed position in the series. The process is comparable to that observed in other areas of language learning: the normal quantity, one, needed no expression; 'two' began to fill the place of 'more than one';[4] finer distinctions of quantity were still beyond the child's reach.

During the third year, the progress was slight. She learned to state her age as 'two years old' (2;0, § 662) by mechan-

[4] Hildegard's younger sister Karla would take a handful of candy at the same age when she received permission to take two pieces. Apparently 'two' meant indefinite plurality to her. She could count to ten at the beginning of 1;11, with preference for and better accuracy in the higher numerals of the series.

ical imitation. She restated the 'three little kittens' of the nursery rhyme in her own way as 'three meows, (2;1, § 672); this shows that she understood the noun, but proves nothing with regard to the numeral; seeing a picture of three cats during the same month (§ 676), she simply stated 'meows,' without interest in the number. She added 'four' in its German form, 'vier,' 2;1 (§ 669), as a vocabulary item, but used it rarely (§ 676). As an announcement of jumping and other sudden actions, the hybrid series of numerals, which late during 1; 11 had taken the form 'three, two, zwei,' returned to 'three, two, zwei, drei,' with the same emphatic intonation which adults used for the purpose, 2;1 (§ 669); a month later (§ 688) it took the form 'zwei, two, three.' There is no later record of this function; presumably, then, its form became standard.

Counting as a mechanical exercise began at 2;4 (§ 709). She counted, with gaps, to seven in English, to eight in German. The learning of the exact sequence was fitful. At 2;5 (§ 714) her favorite style was 'one, two, three, six.' Three months later (§ 728) she counted in German from two to six (the position of 'one' in the series was still weak), in English from one to six, then eight, ten, fourteen; the last numeral was reinforced by our house number, which she learned to say in full two months later, 'fourteen-o-nine'; it had of course no numerical meaning, but was recognized as a numeral (§ 737).

As to numerical concepts, there was even less progress during the third year. Only the concepts one and two became clearer without settling into completely standard expression. At 2;0 (§ 664) Hildegard pointed to two breasts and called them 'two three tummies.' The interesting feature is her attention to number and the vague expression of plurality. At 2;1 (§ 669) she pressed her fixed announcement of jumping, 'three two zwei drei,' into the service of expressing the idea 'many,' when she saw many fishes in an aquarium; she omitted the usual emphatic intonation on this occasion and said the sequence rapidly, definitely with numerical intention. At the same time, 'two' was clear. I told her in German, 'Give Mama a cookie;' whereupon she selected two cookies and asked for permission to change the quantity by saying 'Two?' (cf. § 688). At 2;4 (§ 709) she used the expression 'only one,' which shows that 'one' had a clear numerical meaning; she asked 'Two?' with the meaning of 'May I have two pieces of candy?.' I let her play with my rubber stamps, of which she habitually wanted two. When I gave her one, she demanded 'One, two!' This expression was less standard, but shows how the counting exercises, which had just begun, were contributing to the learning of numerical meanings.

Early during the fourth year (3;3, § 749), she learned to say the rhyme, 'I go so high, I go to the sky, and never come down till the Fourth of July,' while swinging. The time indication containing an ordinal numeral meant nothing to her. Of course, for adults the Fourth of July has lost its character as a simple indication of a date and is overlaid with a host of associations which almost obliterate the origin of the term; this condition is reflected in the irregular capitalization of the ordinal. This complex of associations had not yet been built up in the child; but there was already another association with the month of July: her birthday. The first time she modified the end of the rhyme very freely: 'and never come down any more'. Two weeks later, she reproduced the original more faithfully: 'and never come down till the next of July; that's when

my birthday is, isn't it?' 'Fourth of' was replaced by 'next of' in the interest of preserving the rhythm. The example shows that the ordinal numeral was meaningless for her.

Counting was improved a little. The sequence was correct in German from one to ten, in English from one to eleven. Higher numerals like 'thirty', 'sixty' were acquired merely as vocabulary items without specific meaning. But they were identified as numerals and added haphazardly to the end of the counting series. Once 3;7 (§ 762) she counted in English from one to eleven and added 'sixty-nine' without a pause. (Cf. §§ 752, 756ff.)

But an important step forward was made: the counting began to become functional. At 3;9 (§ 770) she made correct numerical statements by counting up from one. She had grasped the purpose of counting. The way was paved for the understanding of the meanings of the low numerals. Only the abridgement of the counting process expressed by the simple numerals was not yet mastered. It is significant that the child began at the same time to take great interest in matters of measurement and weight, although they remained quite mysterious to her. She inquired often about clock time, and asked about the temperature with the question, 'How much does it weigh outside?'

The direct understanding of numerals remained restricted to the lowest ones. At 3;3 (§ 752) even two did not yet seem to be clearly distinguished from indefinite plurality. At 3;5 (§ 756) one and two were judged to be clear.[5] At 3;6 (§ 757) she had a functional concept of three. She set the table for three persons with the correct number of covers. But the word 'three' was not yet identified with the concept three.

[5] The same was true for Karla at the same age.

During the fifth year she made slow progress in counting. She bounced a big ball up to a hundred times (4;1, § 776); but this exercise, which the adults accompanied with counting, did not lead to rapid improvement in counting. She counted in English correctly to twelve, uncertainly to twenty, haphazardly after twenty, reaching 83 quickly. She did not understand the parallelism of the decades, and we made no effort to teach her. The situation remained essentially unchanged for nine months (§§ 783, 803, 808). She usually counted correctly to 19 in English, to 14 in German, being uncertain in higher numerals. At 4;10 (§ 816) there was sudden progress in English. She counted to 28, with assistance beyond 30, even to 'thirty-ten', which means that the counting of units was mastered, but the decades remained mysterious. At 4;11 she was able to count in English to 37 (§ 818); but in German, which was by that time definitely her secondary language, she still stopped after 14; the progress in German stagnated.

The counting was usually practiced in catching the ball and was to that extent meaningful. She also counted the dots on her dominoes with fair correctness at 4;6 (§ 793). In the same month she asked, 'Is drei three?' (§ 796). The concept three had become abstract enough for bilingual comparison. There were still no observations showing direct comprehension of higher numerals.

The sixth year brought a break in the normal development, because Hildegard spent the first half of it in Germany with her parents. In the months preceding the departure I had induced her to speak more German to me, with considerable success; but this change in procedure had not benefited the counting in German. In Germany, her active language was German after a few weeks,

English being pushed back into passive status; she continued to understand it, but was unable to express herself in English. During this period it was found in several areas that memorized matters withstood the devastation caused by the change of environment better than ingredients of real speech; thus also in the mechanical exercise of counting. She continued to count in English to 24 or 26, and further with assistance (5;1-3, §§ 840, 867). German counting still stopped at 14 (5;1, § 840) or 16 (5;1, § 846). Two months later, the counting was still reliable only to 16; after that, she went in jumps up into the thirties. Even with help, she stopped again and again after 26.[6] In English and German, she did not see the parallelism with the units and with 13-19 (§ 869). At 5;6 (§ 900) the feeling for the German way of counting had progressed far enough to influence the English way. Her mother tried to guess the age of a girl and stated her estimate in English as 'nineteen, twenty'. Hildegard had not paid attention to the conversation, but heard the numerals and took them as a cue for counting. She counted on in English: 'one-and-twenty, two-and-twenty'. This style of forming numerals is, of course, well known in English, did not become obsolete until the nineteenth century, and even enters into the present-day child's experience in the nursery rhyme about the four-and-twenty blackbirds. But in the latter item, it is imitated by children mechanically as one of the many queer, ununderstood or half-understood ingredients with which these archaic traditional pieces are filled. It is for them not a live manner of counting. There is no doubt that Hildegard was influenced by the German style.

During the same half-year, the lowest numerals gained in clarity by themselves. Early in her living in a predominantly German-speaking environment (5;0, § 823), she stated in abominable linguistic form: 'Ich hab drei balls: die, dies und die andere'. The utterance is interesting. The explanatory addition shows that the meaning of 'three' was perfectly clear and not tied to mechanical counting. Also at 5;0 (§ 825) she stated: 'Ich hab zwei Boote'; the very interest in numerical statements testifies to the progress; but it remained confined to the lowest numerals. At 5;1 (§ 838), anticipating the return of her parents from an extended trip and wishing to impress us with her improved appetite, she asked in German whether she should eat five rolls after we returned. This shows that she knew the word 'fünf', appreciated its numerical value as being higher than three, but not that she had a clear idea of the meaning of five. The meaning may have been clear, but there is no way of checking. Numerical statements higher than three are not otherwise recorded. Functional use of counting continued. She counted money in English (5;1, § 840), playing-cards, dots on the cards, dominoes, etc. (5;3 § 867). She learned the dual 'beide' ('both') as a new vocabulary item with correct meaning (5;6, §902). More important, the first ordinal numeral, 'third', appeared in German (5;4, § 887): 'Zweimal: das ist das dreite—das dritte'. The correction was spoken in a whisper; she was consciously paying attention to linguistic form. The first analogical form shows that the ordinal was associated with the corresponding cardinal. That was even clearer at 5;5 (§ 895), when she said: 'Das dritte Mal. Ist "das dritte" drei?'

The first mathematical operation oc-

[6] For the sake of comparison: a German boy, slightly younger, with whom Hildegard played, counted correctly to 19 then in a few irregular jumps to 2000 (§ 864).

curred surprisingly at 5;4. As a joke her grandfather asked her in German: 'If someone gives you three slaps and you give him back two, how many have you?' Without hesitating she answered: 'Eins'. She had gone into a trap; but the amazing feature was that she was able to perform the arithmetic operation involved. No practice of any kind had preceded. This experience proved that the lowest numerals had reached a considerable degree of abstractness. At the same time I discovered that she identified small German coins of two, five, and ten pfennigs, whereas prices meant nothing to her (§ 888).

The growing maturity of the child was also displayed (5;6, § 899) by the fact that she began to read numerals, first those from one to five, a little later (§ 903) with assurance from one to six, less certainly eight and eleven. Eleven was her house number, which she could see at the entrance of the house. She had just learned to say her address (§ 902) as she had been taught to do in case she became lost. She also began to write some of these numerals, often in the air.

After the return to America (5;6), English regained the ascendancy, slowly at first, with increasing momentum later. In counting as in other areas of language, I observed that what she had learned last in German receded first before the onrush of renewed experience in English. Playing checkers with me (5;8, § 922) she had no difficulty in counting to 12 in German (there are 12 markers in the game). But at 5;9 (§ 927) I discovered that she could again count only up to 14 with assurance in German, just as before the departure for Germany, whereas in English she went up to twenty and beyond without difficulty. The proficiency in counting did not increase much in either language. At 5;11 (§ 931) she stopped twice after 26; in German she got as far as 16, then added 19; the series were still mechanical, with no logical penetration of the principles used for forming higher numerals. This situation was radically improved later in the same month (§ 934). While catching the ball, she counted smoothly in German up to 21. Another time she had difficulties after 16, the stopping-place which had become habitual, but counted on with mistakes to 29. She had not yet learned the sequence of the decades and did not clearly understand where a new decade started. At times she tried 'zehn-undzwanzig' ('twenty-ten'). When I helped her with the decades, she could go on, but haltingly and uncertainly beyond the four of each decade, perhaps an after-effect of the long-established terminal point 14. Her lips were moving: she counted the units through each time to find the corresponding combination with a decade. Thus an understanding of the decimal system was developing.

The direct understanding of the value of numerals was satisfactory for low numbers (5;9, § 927), but the sense for the value of money and for clock time was poorly developed. She knew coins less well than in Germany. Yet she succeeded in translating 3:30 from German 'drei Uhr dreissig' into English after pondering the matter. Asked to lay out eight piles of playing-cards (5;11, § 931), she did so correctly. For ten piles she first made too many.

In reading numerals, she had made surprising progress. Playing a picture lotto game with numerals brought from Germany, she displayed a fair proficiency in reading the numbers, which I had not expected. She had practiced the units in Germany on a daily calendar with large numerals; still, she was not quite sure about six, seven, and nine. But she read about 30 per cent of the

two-digit numerals correctly in German. Reading numbers was actually easier for her than counting into the decades. She understood the German principle of reading the unit first and then the decade; but the coördination between unit and corresponding decade, say, between three and thirty, was not clear enough; hence the large number of mistakes (5;7, § 913). She wrote numerals to ten for the hop-scotch game, in which they have to be written into squares on the ground (5;8, § 922). The practice had had its beginnings a year before; the functional value of the exercise for entertainment purposes provided the incentive for the improvement in learning.

Up to the end of the sixth year, all learning of numerals, in fact of language in general, had been functional and guided by the child's own interests. Out of pedagogical conviction, we had abstained from anticipating any matters of school learning. We had used numerals informally as needed in daily living and accompanied her bouncing of the ball with counting. But no formal teaching of numbers or explanation of the principles of forming higher numerals had been resorted to.

At the beginning of her seventh year (6;2), Hildegard entered first grade. I have no record of what was done in kindergarten and first grade with regard to numerals. It was difficult to gain a good picture of school activities, because Hildegard was not very talkative about school. It may be that the school had taught numerals more or less formally. Or it may be that the long preceding practice and the growing intellectual maturity had led to the point where the dam broke. At any rate, 13 days after the beginning of school (§ 948), she was suddenly able to deal with numerals competently in German. She read numerals from one to nine, also zero, reliably and handled the two-digit numbers up to 99 with only a little less assurance. There was only a slight uncertainty with regard to the names of the decades, and that was not due to a lack of understanding of the decimal system, but amounted to a German vocabulary deficiency. In the twenties she used the incorrect formation '—zweizig', which I helped her to correct into '—zwanzig'. The very use of this incorrect form where she had previously used the correct one, proves that she had taken a very important step forward: instead of imitating a sequence mechanically, she proceeded by analogy, the logical foundation of the decimal system—a double analogy: that between the units of each decade and that between the name of each decade and its corresponding unit. If this important progress was attributable to school work (and that is doubtful), Hildegard had immediately transferred the principles learned on English numerals to their German equivalents. Although there is no record, I have no doubt that she handled the English numerals to 99 perfectly, because the vocabulary difficulties of the names of the decades were smaller in her primary language. At this late stage the diary, on which this study is based, recorded only the striking matters, mistakes and defects rather than correct items. The absence of an entry concerning English counting testifies to the fact that it was probably by then conventional.

There is one further entry in the fragmentary record of the seventh year at 6;9 (§ 957), again concerning German, because the interest was focused on the bilingualism. She counted in German, now rapidly and correctly, high up into the decades, with perfect ease. When I asked her to repeat in order to check, she counted smoothly up to 40. The only defects were that she skipped

one unit in the thirties by mistake and hesitated a second before 30 and 40: the vocabulary uncertainty with regard to the names of the decades in German was not completely overcome, but the system was mastered.[7]

I present these observations as a case history without an attempt at generalization. The study of child language, particularly the linguistic approach to it, is a young science which has not yet reached the stage when fruitful summaries can be made. I have tried to give methodological pointers, which, I hope, will prove helpful to other investigators. More studies of this type are needed to assemble a comprehensive body of source materials.

[7] Karla, who did not really learn to speak German, but understood it quite well, also knew the decimal system in English, but had difficulty as late as 7;11 (§ 997) in comprehending the different German manner of pronouncing two-digit numerals. She had the habit of repeating my German statements in her language, English, in order to check on the correctness of her understanding. After countless rejections of her misinterpretations, she would still translate items like 'dreiundsiebzig' by 37 instead of 73. Hildegard never had this difficulty. At the same time Karla translated difficult time indications like 'halb zehn,' 'zhen Minuten vor elf' fairly correctly. She misinterpreted 'vierzehn' (14) and 'vierzig' (40) constantly as 15 and 50, even as late as 8;9. I never gave her the correct English translation; but when I rejected her version, she would find the correct equivalent on second try, for both the characteristic defects. It was a laborious process to overcome these tenacious deficiencies; it took years.

AN ENGINEER LOOKS AT THE PROBLEMS OF SPEECH RECORDING

C. J. LeBel

The Basic Problem

THE speech clinician and the speech scientist have imposed a very stringent requirement: they demand *faithful* reproduction, not merely *pleasing* reproduction. This demand for exactness involves accurate reproduction of the many acoustic transients which form human speech, which in turn calls for wide frequency range and low distortion. Some clinicians emphasize the quality requirement by remarking that a recorder which is inadequate for its purpose is worse than no recorder at all.

The engineer working on inexpensive recording equipment has never had to achieve *faithful* reproduction; some would refuse to acknowledge their results as even *pleasing*. Broadcast and professional equipment is designed to meet much higher standards—at higher cost. This higher cost is chiefly due to the limited market. Whereas a home recorder manufacturer may sell a *hundred* thousand units per year, the maker of professional units will be very fortunate if his sales for a given model exceed *one* thousand per year. The cost of a given perfection of result is therefore increased several fold.

Recording Media

The following comment on various recording media is based on the professional recordist's point of view. It assumes an interest in wide frequency range and low distortion, perhaps a greater interest than most readers will have for some of their applications.

C. J. LeBEL *is President of the Audio Engineering Society and Vice-President of Audio Devices, Inc. This article is an adaptation from his paper at the 1948 SAA convention in Washington.*

Wire is not favored for high quality work; in fact it was obsolete before it started . The most serious handicaps are the splicing problem and the poor signal-to-noise ratio. The signal-to-noise ratio in practical use is most badly impaired by the printing effect, the transfer of magnetic energy from one wire to another in contact with it on the spool. Since the transfer may go from either wire to the other, a great number of discordant echoes of surprising strength are produced. Jumbled together, they have the effect of increasing the background noise in a most annoying fashion. Successive turns of the magnetic coating on tape are separated from one another by the non-magnetic base (paper or plastic) . This spacing is enough to reduce the printing effect on tape to about 2 per cent of the effect on wire—which reduces it to practical insignificance.

Secondary faults are the non-uniformity of quality from one foot to the next, and the high speed required for a given frequency range. The nonuniformity of quality is partly a metallurgical problem. Metallurgists have always had to achieve uniform physical properties from one foot of wire to the next, but this is the first time they have been concerned with magnetic property variation. It is reasonable to allow them several years more to solve the problem. Another source of non-uniformity has been rotation of the wire from recording to playback. During reproduction the wire will contact the head polepieces at points around the circumference which are different from those contacted in recording. It has been shown that this change in

contact will lead to loss of high frequency response. High recording speed provides handling and breakage problems and complicates rewinding (which has to be done at still higher speed).

In view of all these factors, it is easy to understand why tape is the medium used for highest quality magnetic recording today. Hence, a useful comparison would be one of magnetic tape and lacquer disc within the framework of your special requirements. Wire is gradually being relegated to the few places where its features of very long recording time in a given space and of low cost are significant.

Lacquer disc has been in use for so many years that its problems are well known. These involve a limited amount of mechanical dexterity in lowering the cutting head, in adjusting the depth of cut, and in changing the cutting stylus. The only item which needs regular attention is the cutting stylus, which must be charged every five or ten hours of recording. Reproduction is as simple as playing a phonograph record, and the reproducing stylus has almost infinite life if used on lacquer only. Disc has the additional advantages of more compactness for a given playing time and of great ease in selecting any portion of a long recording.

While not over fifteen minutes can be recorded on one side of a sixteen inch disc by ordinary methods, forty minutes can be put on by microgroove techniques. Most machines used in schools can be converted to microgroove very easily, for conversion equipment is readily obtainable. Recent experiments indicate that microgroove is practical in the school right now (as long as processing is not wanted).

Tape has the great virtues of being reusable and of being suited to recording periods as long as an hour. The amount of mechanical dexterity required is less, and the tape recorder will run without attention. However, rewinding is a nuisance, selecting a specific portion of a long recording is even worse, and a tape library is bulky and expensive. You can cut a tape into short lengths, each one selection long, but the work of threading up, running and rewinding short bits is a real annoyance.

The requirement of short recording time can be met with either disc or tape. The only convenient way to handle short playing time on tape is to use a double track unit which provides automatic reversal. This will record on a short length of tape, reverse, and record back to the beginning on the other track. It will then be ready to reproduce both tracks. A machine fitted with Anderson's loop adapter would be even more convenient.

Some Overlooked Tape Problems

Tape has a number of maintenance and operating problems which have been generally overlooked. They occur rather more often than the need for disc recorder maintenance and require more skill than does a disc machine. Their effect is gradual and very insidious; measuring the resulting quality deterioration takes both skill and equipment.

Recording and reproducing heads foul up. After a period of use the head surface will accumulate a layer of resin, the tape will not touch the metal, and the high frequency reproduction will deteriorate rapidly. Cleaning a set of heads is more trouble than changing a cutting stylus.

Magnetic heads wear, and the high frequency response suffers. This deterioration is particularly insidious because of its gradualness, and unless measuring instruments are applied regularly, a machine may be used long beyond the point at which quality has become poor.

Worn heads can be replaced but only by a mechanic.

The tube used to supply bias is likely to be another cause of slow deterioration of quality. As you undoubtedly know, all magnetic recorders currently made apply a supersonic voltage to the recording head during recording. The value of the voltage is of importance; if it is above a certain critical amount, a small variation will do little harm, but when the tube has deteriorated through use this bias voltage will fall below the critical value, and the distortion will increase steadily. Only the most expensive professional machines have built-in provision for convenient and rapid checking of bias voltage—yet such a check should be made once a week.

Low cost home machines too often lack, and professional machines often have too little, provision for adjusting machine characteristics to the use of tapes with different characteristics. When you buy a camera, you rightfully expect it to be usable with film of different speeds and contrasts. Present tape recorders do not provide comparable flexibility. At the moment that is not so serious, but as research develops new magnetic coatings with improved quality, the lack of flexibility will hurt.

If the tape is to be recorded on one machine and reproduced on another, two problems arise. First, the heads on both machines must be aligned identically with respect to the tape, otherwise the reproduction of consonants will be very unsatisfactory; and secondly, the response of the second machines must match that of the first lest the reproduction in some portion of the tonal range be unsatisfactory. Such quality variations make it particularly inadvisable to record debates on tape unless all tapes are recorded and reproduced on the same machine. Since there is no provision for adjustment of head alignment on most tape recorders available for such work, there may be startling changes in apparent quality of diction from one section of tape to the next. This objection is not valid if professional machines with adjustable heads are used.

Finally, there has been a great deal of inquiry about the permanence of magnetic tape. So long as the roll is not exposed to strong magnetic fields, we may expect the magnetic condition to weaken very slowly. On the other hand the base material and the resin which binds the magnetic oxide to the base are by no means as stable.

The base, if of paper, will probably have a life of between ten and forty years. At the end of that time it may be so brittle and weak as to break to pieces on reproduction. After some unfortunate experiences with the peculiarities of vinyl plastic (such as the Germans used), American practice has settled on cellulose acetate for a plastic base. We know from film experience that cellulose acetate will become brittle and weak with age, though the process can be delayed by proper humidification. The life has been set as at least ten years by an experienced plastic chemist.

If you wish to preserve famous voices of the past, the most sure way is to put them on a phonograph record. The pressings and the metal master are known to be very durable. As a second choice, record on lacquer and preserve the disc in a dustproof can. At the moment the most speculative method is to put the recording on tape. Ten years from now this may not be the case, but it is certainly true right now.

Although everyday recording can avail itself of the reusability economy of tape, the occasional class record for the file should be on lacquer. Successive cuts

can be taken at intervals until the final recording at the end of the course.

Removing Quality Bottlenecks

It should be pointed out that a great deal of the quality impairment in a portable machine results from the accessories used. The microphone and loudspeaker are particularly at fault. Occasionally the means of measuring recording level is inadequate—a flashing neon lamp is much too crude, for example, and an excessively sluggish meter is almost as bad.

Almost anyone can change these accessories easily. The cost of such a step may be unpleasantly high—half the cost of the original machine—since the market for high quality microphones and loudspeakers is as limited as that for high quality recorders. It is believed that a number of low cost tape machines, which will hit the market in the next three months, will be of high enough quality to warrant the cost of such improved accessories.

Conclusion

I am afraid that recording equipment with a 10,000 cycle range at a suggested cost of $135 will be designed only when the fundamental thinking of a certain class of engineers has been changed. Most engineers working on low priced equipment suffer from the delusion that the public does not want wide frequency range. They overlook the fact that the public does not wish distortion products and noise to be obtrusive. Given a choice of wide frequency range plus noise and distortion, versus reduced range with noise and distortion subdued, the public will pick the reduced range. A statistical study of published listener preference tests indicates that with a low distortion source about 50 per cent of the listeners prefer an 8,000 cycle upper limit or higher. Published data upholds this statement, published conclusions do not; so we have a divergence analagous to that prior to the recent national election polls.

High quality equipment has been available if the buyer knew where to look. In the professional field wide range tape recorders have been on the market for about a year. At the start nine thousand cycle range cost about $300, and 15,000 cycles cost at least $3,000; but within the last four months 15,000 cycle equipment has become available at about $800. Within the next three months several tape machines will reach the market, priced in the $125 to $150 range. At least one of these will offer usable response up to seven thousand cycles (excluding microphone and loudspeaker).

Contrary to general opinion, professional interest in raising the cutoff of magnetic recorders to 15,000 cycles is not based on exhaustive tests. It is based on Federal Communication Commission regulations for FM station characteristics. There is considerable doubt that 15,000 cycle range is necessary even for music, in spite of the fact that phonograph and transcription records have been recorded with a useful range of 12,000 cycles for at least ten years.

A great deal of the foregoing material is in direct contradiction to what has been popularly written. This discrepancy between what is practiced and what is published has existed for many years, to the extent that even engineers may become misinformed. I would be happy to answer readers' queries on the subject of recording, particularly on any point raised by this paper.

THE PREPARATION OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT'S SPEECHES

Earnest Brandenburg

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT 'has [already] become a towering figure in U. S. mythology.'[1] Less than half a decade after his death, his position as one of this nation's outstanding political leaders seems certain. Since his eminence is commonly recognized as stemming in large part from his speaking ability,[2] a consideration of the methods of preparing Franklin Roosevelt's speeches would seem of interest and value.

I

Widely varying opinions are held as to whether or not Mr. Roosevelt wrote his own speeches. Accusations were common that he was content simply to let others prepare the addresses he delivered. The mordant H. L. Mencken, when asked what he thought of the wide praise accorded Roosevelt for his ability as a speaker, replied, 'I think it's hooey. I don't believe Roosevelt writes his fireside speeches.'[3] Another critic bluntly stated: 'He had never done much writing. He was one of those many public men who were willing to have their speeches written for them.'[4] On the other hand, unequivocal statements have frequently been made that Roosevelt did 'write his own speeches.'[5]

Which of these views one accepts depends upon his particular definition of the word *write*, for the general procedure of preparing Roosevelt's speeches has been explained both by the late President himself and by several of his advisers who worked with him at various times. In the 1937 collection of his *Public Papers and Addresses*, Roosevelt explains in detail 'the preparation of campaign speeches as well as speeches on other occasions.' He freely admits:

> I have called on many different people for advice and assistance. . . . On various subjects I have received drafts and memoranda from different people, varying from short suggestions as to a sentence here and there to long memoranda of factual material, and in some cases complete addresses.
>
> In addition to such suggestions, I make it a practice to keep a "speech material file. . . ." Whenever anything catches my eye, either in the course of reading articles, memoranda, or books, which I think will be of value in the preparation of a speech, I ask her [Miss Marguerite A. Le Hand, Personal Secretary] to put it away in the speech material file. . . .
>
> In preparing a speech I usually take the various office drafts and suggestions which have been submitted to me and also the material which has been accumulated in the speech file on various subjects, read them carefully, lay them aside, and then dictate my own draft, usually to Miss Tully. Naturally, the final speech will contain some of the thoughts and even some of the sentences which appeared in some of the drafts or suggestions submitted.

EARNEST BRANDENBURG *is Assistant Professor of English at Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.*

[1] Hamilton Basso, The Roosevelt Legend, *Life*, 3 November 1947, 23, 126.

[2] Karl Schriftgieser, *The Amazing Roosevelt Family, 1613-1942* (New York, 1942) 347; Lew Sarett and William Trufant Foster, *Basic Principles of Speech* (New York, 1936) 561; Archibald Campbell Knowles, *A Rendezvous With Destiny* (Philadelphia, 1946) 55-6; Mabel Platz, *The History of Public Speaking* (New York, 1935) 282; O. G. Villard, Evolution of President Roosevelt, *Contemporary Review* 145(1934). 522-30; Albert Shaw, One Year of President Roosevelt, *Review of Reviews* 89 (March 1934). 11-5.

[3] Mencken Derides Roosevelt Voice, *New York Times*, 21 October 1937.

[4] John T. Flynn, *Country Squire in the White House* (New York, 1940).57.

[5] Knowles, 13; Frank Kingdon and Rex Stout, *That Man in the White House* (New York, 1944).128.

I suppose it is human that two or three of the many persons with whom I have consulted in the preparation of speeches should seek to give the impression that they have been responsible for the writing of the speeches, and that one or two of them should claim authorship or should state that some other individual was the author. Such assertions, however, are not accurate.

On some of my speeches I have prepared as many as five or six successive drafts myself after reading drafts and suggestions submitted by other people; and I have changed drafts from time to time after consulting with other people either personally or by telephone.[6]

This explanation of his general method has been confirmed by those close to the President. Frances Perkins, who served in Roosevelt's cabinet during the entire time he was President, relates that his advisers and associates were eager to do their best in helping the President, and that Roosevelt, in turn, was happy to receive suggestions.[7] Robert Sherwood has explained:

When he wanted to give a speech for some important purpose, whether it was connected with a special occasion or not, he would discuss it first at length with Hopkins, Rosenman, and me, telling us what particular points he wanted to make, what sort of audience he wished primarily to reach and what the maximum word limit was to be. He would dictate pages and pages, approaching his main topic, sometimes hitting it squarely on the nose with terrific impact, sometimes rambling so far away from it that he couldn't get back, in which case he would say, "Well—something along those lines—you boys can fix it up."[8]

Eleanor Roosevelt called her husband's speech preparation a 'regular routine.'

First of all he decided on the subject with which he was going to deal, then he called in the Government officials charged with the responsibility for the work on this particular subject: for instance, if it was to be a fiscal speech, the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board were consulted; if agriculture, the Department of Agriculture and allied agencies, and so on.

After he had all the facts, he usually sat down with two or three people and explained his ideas of what he wished said. They made a first draft and brought it back to him. He then went over it, and sometimes there were as many as six or eight or ten drafts of the same speech. . . . In between each rewriting my husband went over it again. . . .

When a speech was finally written, my husband always practically knew every word that was in it by heart, as he had gone over it so often. It was the final expression of his original thoughts.[9]

Those who worked with Roosevelt respected the fact that it was he who would and did make the final decisions. He often utilized vast resources to obtain knowledge or furnish ideas, but 'the final thought and the final form of expression [were] his own.'[10] Even after discontinuing work on the President's speeches and maintaining some bitterness toward Roosevelt, Raymond Moley agreed that the President was the one whose ideas and phraseology were predominant in his addresses. Moley advised a friend:

He and I have argued endlessly over what the substance of a speech should be. But once he reached a decision, I've never slipped anything over on him. . . . Remember, when you get to work on speeches, that you're a clerk, not a statesman.[11]

2

I have made a detailed study of seventeen addresses on international affairs delivered by Mr. Roosevelt between September 3, 1939 and December 7, 1941.[12] A brief review of facts uncovered

[6] Franklin D. Roosevelt, *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt* (New York, 1938) 6.391-2.

[7] Frances Perkins, *The Roosevelt I Knew* (New York, 1946) 113.

[8] Robert E. Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins, An Intimate History* (New York, 1948).371-2.

[9] Eleanor Roosevelt, If You Ask Me, *Ladies Home Journal*, 65 (October, 1948).45.

[10] Charles W. B. Hurd, The President's Job, *Current History* 43(1935).233-8. The Silent Orator, *Time*, 19 January 1948, 51, 25; Perkins, 113.

[11] Raymond Moley, *After Seven Years* (New York, 1939) 343.

[12] Earnest Brandenburg, *An Analysis and Criticism of Franklin D. Roosevelt's Speeches on International Affairs Delivered Between September 3, 1939 and December 7, 1941* (State University of Iowa, 1948) Ph.D. dissertation.

concerning the drafting of those speeches will serve to clarify the late President's general methods of speech preparation. Miss Grace Tully, who personally typed most of the drafts for the seventeen addresses analyzed, provided much general information about the procedure and the persons involved in helping Roosevelt prepare those speeches.[13] For each of his addresses, Roosevelt called upon the tremendous resources available to him. Drafts of suggested speeches, or of portions of a possible speech, typically came from some dozen different people, members of the Cabinet, or those in position to be of special assistance.

During the period between September 3, 1939 and December 7, 1941, the President himself normally dictated to Miss Tully the first draft of a speech from his general knowledge or from materials which he had had submitted concerning certain issues. Frequently, some of his close advisers, such as Judge Samuel I. Rosenman, Harry L. Hopkins, Cordell Hull, or Robert Sherwood, were present and would intersperse comments or make suggestions.

After a first draft had been completed, copies of it were circulated to those designated by Roosevelt. For example, Secretary Hull read the speeches having to do with foreign policy. After Henry L. Stimson became a member of the Cabinet, June 20, 1940, he was called upon for suggestions concerning foreign policy. If an issue involving the military was to be included, General Marshall and Admirals Leahy and King were asked for opinions. The various comments and suggestions were then reviewed by Roosevelt or his immediate speech assistants—Rosenman, Hopkins, and Sherwood—and the President would dictate another draft. Or, a new draft might be prepared by one or more of the President's advisers working from marginal notes written into the previous draft by Mr. Roosevelt. The next draft would again be circulated.

Most Cabinet members saw some draft of the speech before it was finally delivered. Cordell Hull, or the Acting Secretary of State, usually saw one or more of the drafts of every one of the speeches of this period. With the receipt of comments and suggestions, and usually in the presence of one or more of his close advisers, Roosevelt dictated a new version of the address. He dictated (holding before him the previous draft which he had marked up in considerable detail) by striking out and substituting words, sentences, or entire sections. Each speech had some three to ten complete revisions. Available at the Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, New York, are drafts which have been numbered for each of the addresses as follows:

Sept. 3, 1939: Drafts 1, 2, and the Original Reading Copy.[14]

Sept. 21, 1939: Draft 2 and the Original Reading Copy.

Jan. 3, 1940: Drafts 1, 2, and the Original Reading Copy.

April 15, 1940: One draft, unnumbered, and the Original Reading Copy.

May 10, 1940: No available drafts.

May 16, 1940: Drafts 1, 2, and the Original Reading Copy.

May 26, 1940: Drafts 1, 2, and the Original Reading Copy.

June 10, 1940: No available drafts.

July 19, 1940: Drafts 1, 2, 3, and the Original Reading Copy.

Sept. 2, 1940: Drafts 1, 2, and the Original Reading Copy.

Dec. 29, 1940: Drafts 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, and the Original Reading Copy.

Jan. 6, 1941: Drafts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and the Original Reading Copy.

Jan. 20, 1941: Drafts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and the Original Reading Copy.

[13] Interview in Washington, D. C., 27 August 1947.

[14] Original Reading Copy is the designation the President gave to the *final* copy—the actual manuscript from which he spoke. The term is employed here to maintain the identifications of manuscripts available at the Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, New York.

March 15, 1941: Drafts 1, 2, 4, 5, and the Original Reading Copy.
May 27, 1941: Drafts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and the Original Reading Copy.
Sept. 11, 1941: Drafts 1, 2, 3, and the Original Reading Copy.
Oct. 27, 1941: Drafts 1, 2, 3, 6, and the Original Reading Copy.

Roosevelt's interest in the opinions of his advisers, as well as the many conferences he held as he worked on his addresses, is well indicated by *The New York Times* account of his activities while he was making final preparations for his address of September 11, 1941:

> On his way from Hyde Park his train stopped at the 138th Street station in New York and picked up Harry L. Hopkins, who brought him a report from all government departments and, it was understood, from Prime Minister Churchill on recent developments.
>
> The two, together with Judge Samuel I. Rosenman, who assists the Chief Executive with some speeches and is regarded as a defense organization expert, were closeted together all the way from New York to Washington. . . .
>
> The President was greeted at the Union Station here by Secretary Hull, who went aboard the Executive's car for a brief chat before they drove to the White House, where they were joined by Secretaries Stimson and Knox.[15]

Roosevelt's former personal stenographer (Miss Tully) had aided in the preparation of all the addresses analyzed, and she attempted to recall exactly which of the advisers around Roosevelt during those years had been most active in helping with each address. She had only her memory to rely upon, but she was reasonably certain that the persons whose names appear below assisted with the addresses given on the dates indicated:

Sept. 3, 1939: Messrs. Hull, Welles, Norman Davis.
Sept. 21, 1939: Judge Rosenman, Messrs. Hopkins, Hull, Welles, Senator Barkley.
Jan. 3, 1940: All Cabinet members, Judge Rosenman, Mr. Hopkins.
April 15, 1940: Messrs. Welles, Hull.
May 10, 1940: Messrs. Welles, Hull.
May 16, 1940: General Marshall, Admiral Leahy, Admiral King, Judge Rosenman, Mr. Hopkins.
May 26, 1940: Judge Rosenman, Mr. Hopkins.
June 10, 1940: Messrs. Hull, Welles.
July 19, 1940: Messrs. Thomas G. Corcoran, Benjamin Cohen, Judge Rosenman.
Sept. 2, 1940: Judge Rosenman (at Hyde Park), Mr. Ickes (on train to Tennessee).
Dec. 29, 1940: Messrs. Robert Sherwood, Hopkins, Hull, and Judge Rosenman.
Jan. 6, 1941: All Cabinet members, Judge Rosenman, Messrs. Hopkins, William Knudsen, Sherwood.
Jan. 20, 1941: Judge Rosenman, Messrs. Hopkins, Sherwood.
March 15, 1941: Messrs. Hopkins, Sherwood, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., General James H. Burns.
May 27, 1941: Messrs. Welles, Hull, Sherwood.
Sept. 11, 1941: Judge Rosenman, Messrs. Hopkins, Hull, Stimson, Knox.
Oct. 27, 1941: Messrs. Sherwood, Knox, Hull, Stimson, Welles.

She emphasized the fact that Roosevelt's State of the Union addresses (delivered January 3, 1940 and January 6, 1941) were the product of at least ten days' careful work, and had received comment and suggestions from all Cabinet members.

Miss Tully was understandably reluctant to designate specific portions of the texts as having been contributed by certain individuals. Robert Sherwood, who joined Roosevelt's inner circle of speech advisers and collaborators during the campaign of 1940, has explained that he is able to identify a few

> specific passages or ideas that were suggested by Hopkins, Rosenman or me or by others outside the White House, but the collaboration between the three of us and the President was so close and so constant the we generally ended up unable to say specifically who had been primarily responsible for any given sentence or phrase.[16]

[15] Frank L. Kluckhorn, Roosevelt Likely to Announce Navy Will Protect U. S. Shipments on Seas, *New York Times*, 11 September 1941.

[16] From a letter, dated October 1, 1948, signed by Robert Sherwood, addressed from The Playwrights Co., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York.

Miss Tully did remark that the frequent succession of short sentences was 'completely Roosevelt.' She remembered that the idea of quoting exact flying distances from possible Axis attacking positions to strategic points in the Western Hemisphere was Roosevelt's own idea. He had guessed at the distances and then had Daniel Callahan (of the Department of Justice) check and substitute the correct figures. Miss Tully also found at least one passage she was certain appeared in the final speech almost exactly as originally written by the playwright, Robert Sherwood. When informed of Miss Tully's statement, and asked if he could confirm her memory about that passage, Mr. Sherwood wrote:

> I worked throughout the long preparation of that speech [delivered May 27, 1941]—in fact, I was living in the White House at the time—but I can quite honestly say that I have no idea who made the major contribution to the paragraph you quote. I should guess that it represented a composite of the various minds then at work, but the final sentence about "our children . . . goose-stepping in search of new gods," sounds to me as if it had been written entirely by President Roosevelt himself.[17]

3

I have found no indications that Franklin Roosevelt spent any time thinking about the organization to be followed in any address. Rather, he dictated (or wrote) a first draft, with no particular concern about the over-all structure. As a result, perhaps, no characteristic organizational patterns are to be noted in his addresses. Typically, he discussed some three to ten different topics in a speech, with each unit complete in itself. Miss Tully reported that Judge Rosenman was the person most responsible for organization. The President trusted the Judge's ability to rearrange the speeches by changing sections from one part of an address to another.

Available at the Roosevelt Library in Hyde Park are three sheets of yellow paper upon which Franklin Roosevelt had written in pencil what was obviously the first draft of his third inaugural address, delivered January 20, 1941. Seven successive drafts of this speech have been preserved, so we know it went through at least that many stages. Yet the first half of the final speech followed closely the pattern of ideas originally written by the President, and many striking phrases appear almost exactly the same in the first and the last versions. In the President's handwriting, for example, appeared the following:

> Always it is worth while in the midst of swift happenings to pause for a moment to take stock of our thoughts. If we do not we risk a pitfall or a wrong turning.
>
> Eight years ago a danger hung over our land; we were in the midst of it; we knew its shock and its actual immediate bearing upon our daily lives as individuals and as a nation. We sensed its causes, and we were in agreement that quick action, unwanted action, bold action, was not merely desirable but urgently requisite.

Note the following excerpts from the address of January 20, 1941, as actually delivered by Roosevelt:

> To us there has come a time, in the midst of swift happenings, to pause for a moment and take stock—to recall what our place in history has been, and to rediscover what we are and what we may be. If we do not, we risk the real peril of isolation, the real peril of inaction. . . .
>
> Eight years ago, when the life of this Republic seemed frozen by a fatalistic terror, we proved that this is not true. We were in the midst of shock, but we acted, we acted quickly, boldly, decisively.

[17] Mr. Sherwood's statement is quoted from the same letter as the preceding footnote. The passage in question is the following from the address of May 27, 1941: 'Even our right of worship would be threatened. The Nazi world does not recognize any God except Hitler; for the Nazis are as ruthless as the Communists in the denial of God. What place has religion which preaches the dignity of the human being, of the majesty of the human soul, in a world where moral standards are measured by treachery and bribery and fifth columnists? Will our children, too, wander off, goose-stepping in search of new gods?'

This typical instance gives further credence to the testimony of the President and others that Roosevelt laid down the broad outlines of his addresses and was personally responsible for many of the striking phrases he used.

Materials were frequently forwarded to Roosevelt which had been prepared as a speech or a possible portion of a speech. For example, the Hyde Park Library has, with the collections of the various drafts of the December 29, 1940 address, a fourteen page manuscript written by Dorothy Thompson and forwarded to the President for use if he desired. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt had sent the manuscript to the President since it bore this note:

For the President:
F.D.R.

Dorothy Thompson says she offers this humbly as suggestions for what she longs to hear you say.

E. R.

Miss Thompson's suggestions, dated December 13, 1940, dealt with the general problem of America's peril with a world at war and the necessity of supplying aid to the Allies, a subject which the President did consider in his next address, delivered December 29, 1940. There were no apparent transfers from her manuscript to his, however, in terms either of ideas or of phraseology.

On the other hand, almost all the specific facts Roosevelt used in his speech of September 11, 1941, in which he argued for 'freedom of the seas' and announced that the American navy would, henceforth, shoot German war vessels 'on sight,' were included in a five and one half page 'Memo' from Cordell Hull.[18] Robert Sherwood, however, quotes at some length from Harry Hopkins' notes to show that Roosevelt did request and use Hull's ideas, but only to the extent that he agreed with them. Hopkins had recorded:

The President liked the statement Hull was making verbally [at a conference on Sept. 5th of Roosevelt with Hopkins and Hull to discuss the address of Sept. 11, 1941] and asked him to dictate what he had just said and send it to the White House late that afternoon.

The draft from Hull arrived and instead of being the vigorous, determined memorandum that had been represented in his verbal talk with the President, it was a pretty weak document, although it built up a fairly strong case for the necessity for some action. But there was no recommendation of any action.

The President, of course, said at once that Hull's draft was totally inadequate. . . . We made another draft. . . .

I later learned from the President that Hull made a very strong argument, urging the President to take out of the speech the real guts in it [reference to shooting first]. The speech itself indicates that this was not done.[19]

On the last page of the typed copy from which Roosevelt talked when he delivered his address of July 19, 1940, appear these words in his own handwriting, 'I put in a number of extemporaneous interpolations.' Similarly, on the last page of the Original Reading Copy of the March 15, 1941 address, Roosevelt wrote under his signature, 'Original Reading copy, but there was much "ad libbing!"' Those comments were not exaggerations, and they might well have been made for almost any of his addresses.

The first two or three minutes of his address of September 2, 1940, illustrate Roosevelt's typical *platform* revisions. The italicized portions were added to the text during delivery; the sections in parentheses were omitted by the President from his prepared manuscript:

Secretary Ickes, Governor Hoey, Governor Cooper and our neighbor, Governor Maybank

[18] Dated September 6, 1941, the memorandum was in the form of a telegram signed by 'Hull.' Available at the Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, New York.

[19] Robert E. Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins, An Intimate History* (New York, 1948) 371-2.

of South Carolina, and my friends from all the states:

I have listened with attention and great interest to the thousands of varieties of plants and trees and fishes and animals that Governor Cooper told us about, but he failed to mention the hundreds of thousands of species of human animals that come to the park.

Here in the Great Smokies, we (meet today) *have come together* to dedicate these mountains, and streams and forests, *the thousands of them,* to the service of the *Millions of* American people. We are living under governments (which) *that* are proving their devotion to national parks. The Governors of North Carolina and of Tennessee have greatly helped us, and the Secretary of the Interior is so active that he has today ready for dedication *a number of other great National* (two more) parks—*like* Kings Canyon in California and the Olympic National Park in the State of Washington, *the Isle Park up in Michigan and, over here, the Great Cavern of Tennessee,* and soon, I hope, *he* will *have another one for us to dedicate* (a third,) the Big Bend Park *away down* in Texas, *close to the Mexican line.*

4

Roosevelt showed his ability to adapt his phrasing and thoughts with instant facility. In delivering his address of September 21, 1939, the President, instead of saying as he planned, 'When and if repeal of the embargo is accomplished,' introduced, following the word *if,* the additional sentence, 'I do not like even to mention the word *if,* I would rather say when—when. . . .'

In his address of May 26, 1940, the President followed a rhetorical question with some unpremeditated explanation. After the sentence, 'What did we get for this money?' he added, 'Money, incidentally, not included in the new defense appropriations, only money hitherto appropriated.'

Besides deliberately introducing ideas and comments as he was speaking, he also adapted his words to fit the unexpected. In his address of January 20, 1941, for example, he had planned the sentence, 'If we do not, we risk the real peril of inaction.' Instead of saying *inaction,* he mis-read the word as *isolation,* but then immediately followed with the words, 'the real peril of inaction.' The sentence as actually delivered was: 'If we do not, we risk the real peril of isolation, the real peril of inaction.' Roosevelt's own pride in his ability to do this sort of thing is indicated by the note in his handwriting on the Original Reading Copy of this address. He underlined the word *inaction* and wrote, 'I misread this word as "isolation"—then added "and inaction." All of which improved it! FDR.'

Mr. Roosevelt frequently placed long dashes in his manuscript, apparently where applause was expected. When applause from his immediate audience unexpectedly interrupted his train of words, the President skillfully adapted to the situation by introducing some additional bit of explanation. In the State of the Union address of January, 1940, the President had stated: 'The only important increase in any part of the budget is the estimate for national defense. Practically all other important items show a reduction.' Applause broke out. Roosevelt had intended to express, then, his request for additional taxes 'to meet the emergency spending for national defense.' He met the unexpected applause, however, with the rejoinder: 'But you know you can't eat your cake and have it, too.' The applause which followed this impromptu remark lasted more than twice as long as that which preceded it, and Roosevelt then continued as he had intended.

In his 'defense message' of May 16, 1940, the President planned to say: 'I ask for immediate appropriation of $896,000,000 divided approximately as follows:' But as he stated the amount of money, Congress, to whom he was speaking at a joint session of the two houses,

broke into applause. He then made the comment: 'And may I say that I hope there will be speed in giving the appropriations,' which drew even greater applause. After that, Roosevelt continued: 'That sum of $896,000,000 of appropriations I would divide approximately as follows:'

Copies of Roosevelt's speeches were released to the press before they were actually delivered, a common practice to enable newspapers to make their deadlines. Although the President did *extemporize* considerably, he also wrote into his own copy before delivering a particular address some deviations from the text released to the press. Examples occur in almost every speech. Sometimes the President wrote in a change, but preferred in delivery the presentation he had previously approved, or changed the wording in still another way.

5

To summarize: In the preparation of his speeches during the period studied Franklin D. Roosevelt relied on a number of his advisers (most notably, Judge Samuel I. Rosenman, Robert E. Sherwood, Harry Hopkins, and Cordell Hull) both for materials and for suggested ways of expressing ideas. Various persons voluntarily forwarded ideas to the President for consideration in his addresses, and he frequently requested specific information. Roosevelt decided the final phraseology. The ultimate product of combined efforts invariably yielded addresses indentifiable as peculiarly *Rooseveltian*.

Each of his important addresses went through a number of revisions and was the product of long, careful work both from the President and several of his advisers. Available resources of government, fact-finding agencies, opinions of Cabinet members, expert advice from military men—were all called upon for specific details and for general plans. Roosevelt made many changes in his speeches as he was speaking. He was particularly adept at handling unexpected situations as they arose. Some supposedly impromptu changes, however, had actually been written into his own manuscript. The investigation of Franklin Roosevelt's methods of preparing seventeen of his addresses on international affairs reveals that the late President was the primary source of the ideas, the arguments, and the language of those speeches.

OBSERVATIONS ON ROOSEVELT'S LITERARY STYLE

Joseph Schiffman

He that will write well . . . must speak as the common people do . . . and so should every man understand.

—Roger Ascham

IN an age of fearful confusion and deadly conflict, Franklin Delano Roosevelt developed a literary style that won the admiration of friend and foe alike. I should like to show how Roosevelt, in fashioning his style, drew heavily upon America's literary heritage, thereby raising to new heights the level of public expression in America.

The needs and interests of his public molded Roosevelt's style. At press conferences he was colloquial and anecdotal, as if aware of the pressure upon working newspapermen for sprightly copy. In addressing Congress he was rather formal, though less so than any other President. And in political campaign speeches, when he met his public face to face, Mr. Roosevelt became earthy, using short, peppery sentences, homely analogies, spelled-out programs, folk expressions, and occasional slang.

Roosevelt's winning qualities as a spokesman were based mainly upon his ability to sense the language and experiences of his audience. In the 1944 Presidential election campaign, he used the word *botch*, and S. Stevenson Smith, a grammarian, remarked that though the word is seldom dignified in print, 'it is a word every farm boy knows and uses.' In the 1940 campaign FDR used *razz*, a colorful word readily understood in all its connotations by his Boston audience. Another favorite bit of Roosevelt slang was 'chiseling worker's wages,' an expression commonly used by working people. By going to the factory, farm, and field for his expression, Roosevelt followed the literary theory of Emerson and the usages of the Bible, Whitman, and Twain.

JOSEPH A. SCHIFFMAN *is an Instructor in English at Long Island University.*

1

Like Walt Whitman, Roosevelt used various repetitive devices in getting his ideas across. This was especially marked in campaign addresses. At Madison Square Garden on October 31, 1936, he used initial repetition in speaking of a national role of honor:

> Written on it are the names of millions who never had a chance—men at starvation wages, women in sweatshops, children at looms.
>
> Written on it are the names of those who despaired, young men and young women for whom opportunity became a will-o'-the-wisp.
>
> Written on it . . .

These repetitive phrases served to impress upon the audience the main motif of the speech. Repetitive devices are as old as literature itself, going back to Biblical writers and the medicine men of primitive tribes.

Of all America's great poets, Whitman was most fond of repetitive devices. Here is Whitman's use of initial repetition in his poem Song at Sunset:

> Good in all,
> In the satisfaction and aplomb of animals
> In the annual return of seasons,
> In the hilarity of youth
> In the strength and flush of manhood,
> In the grandeur and exquisiteness of old age,
> In the superb vistas of death.

In his famous One-Third Of A Nation speech made on the occasion of his Sec-

ond Inaugural Address, Roosevelt again spoke in terms reminiscent of Whitman:

> Here is the challenge to our democracy. . . .
> I see millions of families trying to live on incomes so meager that the pall of family disaster hangs over them day by day.
> I see millions whose daily lives in city and on farm continue under conditions labeled indecent by a so-called polite society half a century ago.
> I see millions denied education. . . .
> I see millions lacking . . . means. . . .
> I see one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill clad, ill nourished.

In I Sit and Look Out Whitman had said:

> I see in low life the mother misused by her children dying, neglected, gaunt, desperate,
> I see the wife misused by her husband, I see the treacherous seducer of young women,
> I mark the ranklings of jealousy and unrequited love attempting to be hid, I see these sights on earth,
> I see the workings of battle, pestilence, tyranny, I see martyrs and prisoners.

And, like Whitman 'who celebrated himself and sang himself,' Roosevelt used the word *I* plentifully. Here is a paragraph from a Fireside Chat that shows Roosevelt's lack of reserve in using *I*:

> That is why again this year I have taken trips to all parts of the country. Last spring I visited the Southwest. This summer I made several trips in the East. Now I am just back from a trip all the way across the continent, and later this autumn I hope to pay my annual visit to the Southeast.

Was Roosevelt's profuse use of *I* the product of egotism, or was it an artistic *I* used as a symbol for and of the nation? No doubt Roosevelt had a strong ego and this side of his personality plus his abiding concern with the fate of the individual in our highly complex society inspired his *I*. In this respect again he resembles Whitman as a literary artist. Whitman in his day also proclaimed that he spoke for the common man, that he was attempting to 'incarnate' the nation with his *I*.

And again like Whitman, Roosevelt was fond of cataloguing in attempting to convey the rich diversity of America. In his call for full response to national defense in December 1940, Roosevelt said:

> I well remember that while I sat in my study at the White House, preparing to talk with the people of the United States, I had before my eyes the picture of all those Americans with whom I was talking. I saw the workman in the mills, the mines, the factories; the girl behind the counter; the small shopkeeper; the farmer doing his spring plowing; the widows and the old men wondering about their life's savings.

In Song of the Banner at Daybreak, Whitman had painted a similar picture in these terms:

> I see numberless farms, I see the farmers working in their fields or barns,
> I see mechanics working, I see buildings . . . going up, or finished. . . .
> I see the stores, depots, of Boston, Baltimore, Charleston, New Orleans. . . .

By the 1930's many important American writers, including Carl Sandburg, Dorothy Thompson, and Thomas Wolfe, were writing in Whitmanesque terms, and it is probable that Roosevelt absorbed this style through the writers of his own period. Once he actually quoted Sandburg in speaking of Chicago as 'The City of the Big Shoulders,' but he never mentioned Whitman. However, The Good Gray Poet seems to be a pervasive influence in Roosevelt's style, as is the case with so many contemporary writers. As Canby said of Whitman's poetry: 'it has become a currency which provides a common exchange of poetic ideas throughout the democratic world.'

2

In his campaign speeches, Roosevelt used homely symbols that his listeners readily understood and appreciated. He spoke to them in terms they themselves

used. For example, he used the symbol of the house key when he tried to tell the people that he had always been aboveboard with them:

> The American people know from a four-year record that today there is only one entrance to the White House—by the front door. Since March 4, 1933, there has been only one passkey to the White House. I have carried that key in my pocket. It is there tonight. So long as I am President, it will remain in my pocket.

The audience understood this bit of folk symbolism and applauded enthusiastically. Roosevelt used it again in his Jackson Day Address in 1938. He then said, referring to the symbol now identified with his name: 'The White House door is open—I am forgetting about that famous key just now—the White House door is open to all our citizens who come to help eradicate . . . evils.'

In his use of folk expressions and the familiar, Roosevelt followed in the tradition of Mark Twain. The influence of Twain upon Roosevelt was obvious and avowed. Roosevelt told Cyril Clemens of the International Mark Twain Society:

> If people like my choice of words and oratorical style, it is largely due to my constant study of Mark Twain's works, which have influenced me more than those of any other author.

Roosevelt did most of his reading in Twain as a youngster, before the pressure of public affairs overtook him. His library was rich in Marktwainiana, and the International Mark Twain Society asserts that Roosevelt got the phrase 'The New Deal' from Twain's *Connecticut Yankee*.

He characteristically used folk expressions such as 'our happy valley,' 'rattlesnake poised to strike,' 'dying by inches,' and the July 4th 'each and every.' Though these expressions are condemned as timeworn, Roosevelt used them dramatically and effectively. For example, in speaking of the war in the Pacific, he used the folk expression 'Tell it to the Marines' in this dramatic way:

> From Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo we have been described as a nation of weaklings—'playboys'—who would hire British soldiers, or Russian soldiers, or Chinese soldiers to do our fighting for us.
>
> Let them repeat that now!
>
> Let them tell that to General MacArthur and his men.
>
> Let them tell that to the sailors who today are hitting hard in the far waters of the Pacific.
>
> Let them tell that to the boys in the Flying Fortresses.
>
> Let them tell that to the Marines!

He had pyramided his audience to a dramatic explosive pitch and then had said what the audience itself was aching to say: 'Let them tell that to the Marines!' How welcome is the familiar to our ears—if sensitively used.

Roosevelt had the good teacher's ability to deal with broad sweeps of history in homely, understandable terms. In his report to the nation on the Teheran Conference, he used the symbol of a table:

> The Cairo and Teheran conference . . . gave me my first opportunity to meet the Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and Marshal Stalin—and to sit down at the table with these unconquerable men and talk with them face to face. We had planned to talk to each other across the table at Cairo and Teheran; but we soon found that we were all on the same side of the table.

Always the familiar, the near-at-hand. Speaking to a Chicago audience about the need for a more equal distribution of wealth, Roosevelt used the example of a freight car:

> You people know what I mean when I say it is clear that if the train is to run smoothly again the cars will have to be loaded more evenly. We have made a definite start in getting the train loaded more evenly, in order that the axles may not break again.

Roosevelt also had a deadly faculty for coining rhymes. In 1940 while England reeled under the Luftwaffe, he

spoke of the isolationists who opposed lifting the embargo on shipments of war material abroad. He mentioned the names of the men in opposition, and then—when his audience was filled with the desired contempt—said extemporaneously: 'now wait, a perfectly beautiful rhyme—Congressmen Martin, Barton, and Fish.' Speaking in Boston several nights later, Roosevelt again mentioned Martin, and the audience joyously called out, 'What about Barton and Fish?' It had caught on.

In his ability to sense the language experiences and delights of his audience, and in his ability to speak in homely terms; Roosevelt followed in the footsteps of his boyhood favorite, Mark Twain.

3

Almost all of Roosevelt's speeches end on a forward-looking, optimistic note. His famous Dagger in the Back speech on Mussolini's invasion of a beaten France, ended this way:

I call for effort, courage, sacrifice, devotion. Granted the love of freedom, all of these are possible. And the love of freedom is still fierce, still steady in the nation today.

In encouraging the American people to overcome their helpless feeling in the dark days of the depression, he compared their situation to that of Washington's soldiers at Valley Forge, and then quoted Tom Paine's castigation of 'summer soldiers.' Roosevelt's library was especially rich in American colonial history, and he used his readings in that field to good advantage. He was able to give people a sense of the continuity of history by peppering his talks with pertinent historical allusions and quotations. Sometimes it would be from Jackson or Lincoln, more often from the Bible or from Tom Paine or Jefferson He searched all ages for drama and lessons. He was fond, for example, of quoting from the early history of the Christian martyrs to dramatize the democratic struggle of his own times.

Sometimes he would close an address with words like these: 'In the present spirit of mutual confidence and mutual encouragement we go forward.' Always the call for forward, progressive movement, always faith and understanding in the worth of his audience, usually coupled with an appeal to the Divine Providence. Characteristically, a large number of Roosevelt's speeches begin with the word *I* and end with *God*.

4

I asked Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt about Franklin Roosevelt's reading tastes, and how they might have influenced his writing style. She answered:

Even when he was busiest, he kept reading. He was an avid, lightning-fast reader with a photographic memory, and so he was able to read widely. He reached into all fields that way. His favorite reading was in history and biography. I think, though, that the Bible was the main literary influence on him. He was a student of the Bible, and loved it. He knew all of it very well. At Groton, where he studied as a boy, the Headmaster emphasized the Bible as literature. He gave the Bible course himself, and all students had to take it. I think you will see the influence of the Bible most clearly in the President's Thanksgiving Proclamations and his D-Day Prayer.

Here is a section of Franklin Roosevelt's D-Day Prayer:

Almighty God: Our sons, pride of our nation, this day have set upon a mighty endeavor, a struggle to preserve our Republic, our religion and our civilization, and to set free a suffering humanity.

Lead them straight and true; give strength to their arms, stoutness to their hearts, steadfastness to their faith. . . .

They will be sore tried, by night and by day, without rest—till the victory is won. The darkness will be rent by noise and flame. Men's souls will be shaken with the violences of war.

For these are men lately drawn from the ways of peace. They fight not for the lust of conquest. They fight to end conquest. They fight to liberate. They fight to let justice arise, and tolerance and good will among all Thy people.

They yearn but for the end of battle, for their return to the haven of home.

Some will never return. Embrace these, Father, and receive them, Thy heroic servants, into Thy kingdom. . . .

This prayer is, of course, thoroughly Biblical. In almost every Roosevelt speech there are strong traces of Biblical rhythms, imagery, and phraseology. Robert Sherwood writes of how Roosevelt, in preparing a speech, had his aides search for a half-remembered phrase to be found in an Episcopalian Book of Common Prayer in use when he was at Groton.

5

How much of his speeches did Roosevelt himself write? It is known that he enjoyed the help of many talented people. Judge Samuel I. Rosenman (a Roosevelt aide for eighteen years), Harry Hopkins, and Robert Sherwood (among many others) helped the President in research and preparation. But though these men came and went as their own affairs demanded, Roosevelt's writings follow a definite pattern. They bear the clear imprint of one man, Roosevelt himself. Etched in print is the jaunty chin and buoyant smile; and Roosevelt's salty pleasure in people flavors the page. He carefully reworked the drafts of his aides into final shape. As Sherwood says: 'The speeches as finally delivered were always the expression of Roosevelt himself.' Frances Perkins writes of how Roosevelt 'mulled over' the draft of his aides 'and rewrote it with his own personal ideas and conclusions.' Characteristically, Roosevelt's final revisions were almost always in the direction of simplicity, humor, and neighborliness. The Fala speech, for example, was pure Roosevelt in inspiration, spirit, tone, and calculated effect. Roosevelt's literary efforts played a vital role in his political program; such a calculated role in the face of a generally hostile press that the reader recognizes Roosevelt the writer as the unmistakable twin of Roosevelt the President.

He infused his speeches with a tone of cheerful struggle. He presented himself as the champion of the common man, eager for conflict with the 'enemies of progress.' In a speech in New York, November 1, 1940, he spoke in these characteristic terms:

I am fighting for a free America—for a country in which *all* men and women have equal rights to justice. I am fighting, as I have always fought, for the rights of the little man as well as the big man, for the weak as well as the strong, for those who are helpless as well as for those who can help themselves.

Roosevelt's literary style bears out the patience of the man. Often he would spell out a lesson to the public, reminding us of a patient schoolteacher. In his speech on Pearl Harbor, he painfully described all the steps leading to the attack, and then explained what lessons might be drawn from it.

The night before he died, Roosevelt took his pen in hand to set down the core of his philosophy. Quite characteristically, he began by speaking of Jefferson:

Thomas Jefferson . . . once spoke of a "brotherly spirit of science, which unites into one family all its votaries of whatever grade, and however widely dispersed throughout the different quarters of the globe."

Today, science has brought all the different quarters of the globe so close together that it is impossible to isolate one from another. Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together in the same world at peace.

He had stated the central problem of our time. His abiding concern with this problem gave form and content to his art. In his efforts to win a sympathetic hearing from America and the world, FDR drew on America's democratic tradition in letters. The Bible, Emerson, Whitman, Twain and the American people helped shape his winning style.

PHONETIC TRANSCRIPTIONS

Fulton Lewis, Jr. on Housing Projects

Part of a speech by Fulton Lewis, Jr., radio commentator. The rate of utterance was very rapid; this passage of over five hundred words was spoken in two minutes and twenty-four seconds. Pauses occurred as marked. There were no pauses in many positions where they would be expected, even when the speaker corrected himself or shifted to a new thought sequence.

ˈovɚ ðə ˈwikˈend ˈleᴵdɪz n̩ ˈdʒɛntl̩mən ˈaɪv dɪˈvoᵁtɪd kənˈsɪdrɪbl̩ ˈtaɪm n̩ ˈstʌdɪ tu ˈsʌmθɪŋ ðət ˌgoᵁz ˈbæk tə səm ˈnuz rɪˈpɔʌts wɪtʃ aɪ ˈmeᴵd tu jʊ ˈlæs ˈsprɪŋ ɔn ðə ˈsʌbdʒɪkt ɔv ˈgʌvɚmənt ˈhaʊzɪŋ ‖ aɪ ˈvɪsɪtɪd ˈvɛrɪəs ˈhaʊzɪŋ ˈprɑdʒɛkts ɪn ˈvɛrɪəs ˈpɒːts ɔv ðə ˈkʌntri | rɪˈpɔʌtɪd tu ˈjʉ ɔn ˈhwɒt aɪd ˈfaʊnd ‖ ə ˈgreᴵt ˈmɛnɪ ɔv ˈðoᵁz rɪˈpɔʌts wɚ ʌnˈfeᴵvɚbl̩ pɚˈtɪkjʊɚlɪ ɔn ðə ˈsoˈkɔld ˈslʌmˈklɪrəns ˈproᵁˌgræm | ˈnɑt ðət ðɛɚz ˈɛni: ˈslaɪt dɪsəˈgrimənt æz tu ðə ˈmɛrɪt ɔv | ˈsʌbs̩ɪdaɪzd ˈslʌmklɪrəns ˈhaʊzɪŋ | ðɛɚ ˈɪz ˈnɑt ˌbʌt | ðɛɚ ˈhæz ˈlɔŋ bɪn kənˈsɪdɚbl̩ ˈdɪsˌsæt̬ɪsˈfækʃn̩ əˈbɛʊt wət ðə ˈweᴵ dæt ˈproᵁˌgræm əz bɪn ˈhændl̩d̬ ðə fænˈtæstɪk ˈkɔst ɔv ɪt kəmˈpɛəd wɪð ðə rɪˈzʌlt | ən ðə ˈdʒɛnrəl ədˈmɪnɪsˈtreᴵʃn̩ ɔv ðə ˈhoᵁl ˈθɪŋ ‖ ɪn ðə ˈleᴵst ˌθɾi ˈdeᴵz ˈaɪv sin ə ˈprɑdʒɛkt ɔn ðɪ ˈʔɛʊtskɚts ɔv ðə ˈsɪtɪ ɔv ˈpɑntɪæk ˈmɪʃɪgən wɪtʃ ˈsimz tə mi tə ˈɔfɚ səm ˈvɛrɪ ˈˈvɛrɪ kənˈstrʌktɪv aɪəˈdiəz ‖ frəm ˈmaɪ ˈɑbsɚˈveᴵʃn̩z ɪt wɔz əˈbɛʊt əz ˈgʊd əz ˈmɛnɪ ɔv ðə ˈgʌvɚmənt ˈprɑdʒɛkts | ɑp ðə ˈgʌvɚmɛnt ˈɑpɚˌeᴵtɪd ˈprɑdʒɛks ˈhæd bɪn ˈbæd ‖ ən ˌwaɪl ɪt wɔz ˈnɑt ˈslʌmˈklɪrəns ɪt ˈwʌz eᴵ ˈprɑdʒɛk fɚ ˈloᵁˈɪnkʌm ˈfæmlɪz n̩ ðə ˈlɛsənz n̩ ekˈspɪəɹiənz ˈgeᴵnd frʌm ɪt | simd ə ˈmi ʈu əˈfɔd ə ˈgraʊndˌwɜk ðət ˈmeᴵ kənˈteᴵn ðə səˈluʃən fɚ ət ˈlist ˈˈpɑᵊt ɔv ðə ˈslʌmˈklɪrəns ˈproᵁˌgræm ɔv ðə ˈfjʉtʃɚ ‖ ðɪs ˈprɑdʒɛkt ɪz ˈkɔld ˈoᵁkləʊnd ˈhaʊzɪŋ ɪnˈkɑpəˌreᴵtɪd n̩ ɪz ðə ˈbrenˌtʃaɪld ɔv ðə ˈleᴵt ˈsɛnədɚ ˈdʒɪm ˈkʌzɪnz ɔv ˈmɪʃɪgən | ˈhi wɔz dɪzˈgʌstɪd wɪð ðɪ əˈbɪzməl ˈfeɪljɚ ɔv ðɪ ˈɔθəˌdeɪl ˈprɑdʒɛkt ən ˌwɛsvəˈdʒɪnjə wɪtʃ wɔz ˌmɪsəz ˈroᵛᶻəvʊlz ˈpɛt ˈskim | æn ðə ˈsɪmɪlɚ ˈfeᴵljɚ ɔv ˈʌðɚ ˈgʌvɚˌmɛntəl ˈhaʊzɪŋ ˈprɑdʒɛkts ɔv ˈðæd ˈtaɪm ‖ ˈhi ˈɔfɚd ˈwɛ̃də ˈmɪstɚ ˈhæri ˈhɑpkɪnz hu wəz ˈðɛn ˈhɛd əv ˌɛfˈiˌɑɚˈreᴵ ən ˈɔfɚd ʈu ˌkənˈtrɪbjʊt ˈɛʊt əv hɪz ˈoᵁn ˈpɜsənəl ˈfʌnz ði ɪgˈzækt ɪˈkwɪvələnt ɔv ðə ˈkɔsᵗ ɔv ˈɔθɚˌdel | prəˈvaɪdɪd ðə ˈprɑdʒɛkt wəz ˈbɪlt ˈkloᵁs tə ˌsʌm ˈmɪʃɪgən n̩ˈdʌstrɪəl ˈsɛnɚ | ən hi ˈnu əv ˈkos ðət ˈhi wʊ æn hɪz əˈsoᵁʃɪəts wʊd hæv ɔn ˈɪnfluəns ɪn ðə kənˈsɛpʃn ən ðɪ ədˈmɪnɪsˈtreᴵʃn̩ ɔv ðæt ˈprɑdʒɛk ‖ ˌmɪstɚ ˈhɑpkɪnz ˈtoᵁld ɪm ðə ˈkɔst ɔv ˈɔθɚˌdeɪl wəz ˈfaɪvˌhʌnɚt ən ˈfɪftɪ ˈθaʊzən ˈdɑlɚz wɪtʃ ɪt ˈwʌz ˈnɑt ɪt ˈtɜnd ˈɛʊt tə bi ˈeɪtˌhʌnɚt ən ˈfɪftɪ ˈθaʊzənd | mɪstə ˈʔɑpkɪnz ˈrɒðə ðn ədˈmɪt ɪz mɪsˈʈeᴵk kənˈtrɪbʊʈɪd ðɪ ˈʌðɚ ˈθri ˈhʌn ə ˌhʌndrəd ˈθaʊzənd ˌɛʊt əv ˈgʌvɚmənt ˈfʌnz | ɪn ˈɛnɪ ɪˈvɛnt ðˀə ˈtoʈəl əv ˈeᴵt ˈhʌndrəd n̩ ˈfɪftɪ ˈθaʊzən ˈdɑləz wəz ˈseʈ ˌʌp əz ə rɪˈvɑlvɪŋ ˈfʌnd ən ɪt wəz ˈtɜnd ˈovɚ ɪn ˈtoᵁˈtoʊ | ˈtu ˈði: ˈoᵁkləʊnd ˈhaʊzɪŋ: ˈkəpəˌreᴵʃən ɔv ˈmɪʃɪgən ‖ ˈsɛnɪʈə ˈkʌzəz

ˈθirɪ ˈwʌz ðət ɪndɪˈvɪdʒuəlz ˌhæv ðɛˤ ˈbɛs ˈtʃæəns əv ˈhɛlθɪ ˈsɑund ˈikəˌnɑmɪk səbˈsɪsṭɪns ɪf | ðe ˈhæv ə ˈsmɔl ˈplɑt əv ˈgrɑund ɔn wɪtʃ ðe kn̩ ˈreɪz ðə ˈmeɪdʒə ˈpɑt əv ðɛˤ ˈfud n̩ ˈstɪl bɪ ˈkloᵘs ˌbaɪ ə ˈsentɚ | wɪtʃ ɪn̩ ˈgʊd ˈtaɪmz əˈfodz ði ˌɒpəˈtʊnɪtɪ əv ˈkæʃ ˈdʒɑbz tə ˈkɛərɪ ðm̩ ˌfaɪˈnæntʃəlɪ || ən ˈðɪs ˈprɑdʒɛk ˈʌndɚ ɪz ˈgaɪdəns | kriˈetɪd ə ˈlɪdl̩ kəˈmjʉnɪṭɪ ˈkloᵘs ˌbaɪ ðə ˈsɪtɪ əv ˈpɑndɪˌæk ˈbjʉɪfli ˌleɪd ˈɛʊt wɪ ˈgʊd ˈstrits | ə ˌfʊl ˈeɪkɚ əv ˈgrɑun fɚ ˈɛvrɪ ˌɪndɪˈvɪdʒuəl æn ən ˈˈɛksləɴt ˈhɛʊs ɔn ˈitʃ ˈeɪkɚ | wɛn ˈaɪ ˈseɪ ˈɛksɪləɴt aɪ ˈmin ˈdʒʌs ˈðæt ||

Transcribed from a phonograph record by
ANITA SNYDOVER and ARTHUR S. HOUSE.
University of Illinois

WEST CENTRAL ARKANSAS

One end of a telephone conversation. The speaker's childhood home is in west central Arkansas, in a locality where the pronunciation patterns of the General American area and those of the South meet and blend. Her intonation patterns are, however, completely and strongly southern.

| həˈloʊ | ˌmɪsəz ˈflɑuʷə || ˈhɑʊ ə ˈjiu || ˈoʊ | jiu ˈɒɚ || ˈjiu ˈdʌʊnt ˈseɪ | a ˌdu dɪˈklæɚ || ʌˤ ˌdoʊnt jɪ ˌɛvɚ kʌ ˌdan tə ˈsi əs ˌɛnɪ ˌmoʊɚ || ˈɔ ˌbaɪ jɚ ˈsɛəf | ʌˤ ˌaɪd ˌθɪŋk ˌðæd: ˈwæɚ ju ˈæʊt || ˈjɛs | əv ˈkoʊəs || ˈmi | ˌoʊ | ˌaɪm ˌɔ ˈraɪt || ʌʌ də ju ˌθɪŋk s ˈhæpənd ˈtu mɪ || aɪm ˈteɪkɪn ə ˈtrɪəp || ˌx̃ˈhm̩ | ə ˈlɔʊŋ ˌtrɪəp || tə ˈseɪnt ˈlʊɪs || əm ˌgoɪn tə ˌdraɪv maɪ ˈkɑɚ || ˌnɔo | noˈbɑdɪz ˌgʌʷən ˈwɪθ mɪ || ˌjɪə | ˌɔ ˌbaɪ məˈsɛəf || ˌoʊ | ˈaɪd ˈseɪ əˈbæʊt:u ˈdeɪz || ˌo ˈaɪ do no ˈʌɛ aˈɪm ˌgoɪŋ tə ˈlɪəv | bət ˈðeɪ əl ˌpʊt mɪ ˌʌp ˈsʌmˌʌɛə || ˈoʊ | ˈnæʊ | ˌmɪsɪz ˈflæuʷə || jʊ ˈdo? ˈmin ðə ˈwaɪ ˈˈɛʌm ˈsi ˈeɪ || ˌju ˈmin ðə ˌwaɪ ˈdʌbjə || wl̩ ˌðæt ˌmaɪ? ˌbi ə ˌgʊd ˌpleɪs tə ˈsteɪ ˌəʊ raɪt || ma ˈhʌzbən ˌjʊstə ˌsteɪ ət ðə waɪ ˈɪm || əf ðə ˌwaɪ ˌdʌbjə z əz ˈgʊd | ˈdzi | ət ˌət ə ˌbi ˈˈfaɪʌn | ˈbʌt | ˌa səˈpoʊz aˤ ˌgɛt ə ˌrʊm ə n̩ əˌpɑ:tmənt ˈsʌmˌtaɪm || ˈwɛl | ˈaɪm ə ˈlɪtl̩ ˌskæəd | ˈnju ˈpleɪs | ˈnju ˈwɜk n̩ ˈɛvɪθɪŋ | bət ˈal ˈgɛt ˈjʊst:u ɪt | ˈwɛl | aɪ ˌgat:ə ˈhʌrɪ | mɪsɪz ˈflauʷə || ˈdu ˈkʌm n̩ ˈsi mɪ ˈsʌmˈtaɪm | ɪn ˈseɪnt ˈlʊɪs | ˌa ˈmin || am ˌgəɪŋ tə bɪ ˈləonsəm || ˈoʊ | ˈjɛə | ˌjɛ | ˌðæts ˈraɪt || wəl ˈaˤ bi ˌgʊd | n̩ ˈju bi ˌgʊd || a ˈwɪʊ || gəˈbaɪ || gəˈbaɪ | mɪs ˈflauʷɚ |

Recorded and transcribed by
C. M. WISE,
Louisiana State University

THE FORUM

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The nominating committee recommends for approval at the Convention of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA in December 1949, the following candidates:

President: Horace G. Rahskopf, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

First Vice President: Wilbur E. Gilman, Queens College, Flushing, New York

Second Vice President: Rosalia Marquart, Highland Park High School, Highland Park, Illinois

Members of the Executive Council:

Edna Gilbert, State Teachers College, Minot, North Dakota

Giles Gray, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Sara Lowrey, Baylor University, Waco, Texas

Kenneth S. Wood, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

PAUL MOORE
E. RAY SKINNER
KARL WALLACE
GLADYS L. BORCHERS, *Chairman*

GREETINGS FROM A PIONEER TEACHER

EDITOR'S NOTE: *The following letter was received by President Cortright too late to be read at the final session of the Washington Convention.*

Brandenton, Florida
December 27, 1948

Professor Rupert L. Cortright,
President of The Speech Association of America,
Statler Hotel,
Washington, D. C.

Dear President Cortright:

From sunny Florida, I wish to extend my hearty greetings to the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA. The first association of its kind was organized in New York City in 1892 and joined with the present ASSOCIATION in 1915.

When I review the growth of interest in speech subjects that these two associations have brought about in the United States and in other countries; and the rapid development of credit courses in nearly all of your colleges and universities—especially the growth of graduate study for masters and doctors degrees in speech in many leading institutions—all this in the past sixty years, I am amazed at the progress of Speech education.

Then, too, the adding of Radio to Speech Departments is doing great things for spoken English in this country. Radio corporations are more uniformly insisting announcers should use best speech and that those who speak on their programs should be well trained in voice and pronunciation.

The members of this ASSOCIATION should see that directors of speech programs, plays, readings, debates, and oratorical contests should conform to high standards of speech.

With congratulations and best wishes for the season.

Most sincerely,
THOMAS C. TRUEBLOOD

RECOLLECTIONS OF ARTHUR E. PHILLIPS

Professor Smith's article on Arthur Edward Phillips in the February issue brings to memory one of my most de-

lightful evenings. I was on leave in the fall of 1911, and in November I spent three weeks in and about Chicago visiting departments of elocution, oratory, and, maybe, public speaking. I spent two hours in Professor S. H. Clark's course in reading at the University of Chicago, and we fell into talk about Phillips. I had been using his *Effective Speaking* to some extent in what I fondly called Advanced Public Speaking. Clark very kindly arranged that Phillips and I should dine together at the Auditorium hotel.

By Smith's figures Phillips must have been nearly forty-five; but his abundant white hair made him seem ten or fifteen years older. His exuberant cheerfulness quickly broke down all feeling of strangeness, and we proceeded at once to one of the good meals that the Auditorium could furnish in those days at a price possible even for a professor. I thought I was going to pay for it, but not with Mr. Phillips.

And did we talk! Shop, of course. Or perhaps I had better say, 'Did he talk!' In the more than thirty-seven years that have passed most of this conversation has faded from my memory; but I am sure he told me many of the things Smith records, certainly of methods and of his analysis of great authors and of his synthesis of their ideas in his book. 'And now,' he said in almost these words, 'I have said the last word on public speaking, and next I am going to say the last word on English composition; and then, if I live long enough, I am going to write the great American play!' Then he leaned forward and asked me, 'You think that is very egotistical, don't you?' I grinned and answered, 'Yes I do.' But that did nothing to check his good humor.

After a long talk I said I should have to be getting back to my room quite a bit north, and that I proposed to walk. At this he expressed great alarm, for it was a time of many street assaults. But when I persisted, he could not allow such a countrified chap to go alone and insisted upon walking with me, his arm in mine and with his 5 foot 2 inches on the most threatened side of my 5 foot eleven inches. And the conversation flowed on. We parted finally as blood brothers. I loved him then and afterward.

I must admit that one evening was about all of our friendship. When I saw him briefly at meetings of the English Council and, it seems to me, at meetings of our association, he was rather unapproachable; but it was then plain that his health was very bad.

He was one of the most egotistical men I ever met, certainly the most egotistical man I could like heartily in spite of his conceit. It was quite all right, so open and so kindly. You could laugh at him without offending, and there was no unpleasant superiority.

While some of his books were far from my way of thinking, I had taken up *Effective Speaking* gladly because it was something I had been wishing for, a book that went directly at speech composition. I did not agree with it all, and in particular I thought it was an oversimplification. I did not believe then, and do not now, that the whole subject of rhetoric can be reduced to a strict system. There are lots of ways to do things in speeches. In the public speaking section of the English Council of 1912, a student trained by Phillips spoke on speech preparation. Her discourse certainly would have deserved a high mark as a class review of *Effective Speaking*. I judged, perhaps too hastily, that the book was taught to his students very strictly, and that was all they knew. But the great merit of the book

lay in its insistence on effectiveness as the end, a goal which teachers, wrapped up in their own methods, are too likely to forget. Professor Phillips deserves our gratitude.

There is one point in Professor Smith's article I should like to touch upon, though it is really off the subject. In the first paragraph under 3 he says that the National Association of Elocutionists (I assume he refers to the elocutionists who became speech artists in 1906) became the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking in 1915. As one of the seventeen revolutionists who took our work out of the restraints of the English Council, I must say that is Big News. I do not know what action the speech artists took; but the word *academic* was put into our ponderous title to exclude many of the members of that earlier association; for we were, foolishly or not, very much afraid of elocutionists. At any rate, I am sure that on that Saturday-after-Thanksgiving (in 1914 it was) our superheated minds were not on the speech artists. They were all on the upitiness of the leader of the English Council and on our determination to paddle our own canoe.

JAMES A. WINANS,
Ithaca, New York

TOWARDS A HISTORY OF SPEECH EDUCATION IN AMERICA

In this issue of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL, Professor Gray's article dealing with research in the history of speech education points out what progress we have made towards the history of the teaching of our subject and suggests how much we have yet to learn about our past. Our ASSOCIATION has authorized a volume of studies designed to enlarge and extend our knowledge of the content, methods, and procedures of instruction in speech in the years up to 1921; and it has entrusted the preparation of the volume to the editorial committee named below. The committee realizes that many of our older, veteran teachers have a large store of personal knowledge of their teachers, of the books they used as students, and of the methods and procedures they were exposed to in their school and college days. Since few of them have made such information available in print and since the information they have would be invaluable to the scholars who will be asked to contribute to the proposed volume, the committee urgently requests such cooperation as they are able and willing to give. Specifically, they are urged to write the chairman of the committee and indicate whether they have available materials which will throw light on the teachers, books, and methods that influenced them and whether they will be willing to talk with authors of studies if a personal interview can be arranged. The committee believes that much valuable information may thus be brought to light which would otherwise be lost entirely. The tradition of our endeavor in the late 19th century can be neither accurate nor complete without those who helped to shape it.

Will the veterans with whom we are not already in contact please write to the chairman at 138 Lincoln Hall, University of Illinois?

WARREN GUTHRIE
FREDERICK W. HABERMAN
BARNARD HEWITT
HAROLD WESTLAKE
C. M. WISE
KARL R. WALLACE, *Chairman*

A COMMENT ON THE BROOKINGS SEMINARS

I was glad to read the article by Leland Chapin on The Discussion Techniques of the Brookings Institution. It had been my privilege to attend only one of the Brookings Seminars—the one at Stanford University last summer. My comments, therefore, are based on this limited experience.

There were several features of the Seminars that impressed me most favorably:

1. The excellent resource materials prepared by the Brookings Institution both on background and on special problems were particularly noteworthy. The distribution of these materials far enough in advance of the sessions to enable the participants to read them carefully contributed much to the success of the Seminar. The approach was mature and scholarly without being dull or pedantic. The posing of particular questions of policy with reference to each problem helped to sharpen the issues and to stimulate discussion.

2. The comparatively small discussion groups with experienced leaders in charge produced the kind of situation in which ideas could circulate freely. There was some unevenness in the quality of these groups, but the general average was high. They helped to emphasize again the vitally important fact that a real seminar cannot be held in a mass meeting.

3. The fact that all the proceedings were 'off the record' made for a greater sense of freedom and relaxation in the discussion. There were a few participants who seemed intent on 'making an impression,' but they were happily few (not, I may say, the 'happy few').

4. Equally important was the injunction against 'set' speeches. Even the panels held at the general sessions, which were, in my judgment, the least successful part of the Seminar, were kept reasonably informal.

5. The housing and feeding of the participants in a common dormitory and dining hall was a most important factor in the success of the Seminar. The 'across the table' conversation and the 'tête-à-tête' in the lounges helped immensely in keeping the discussion going on a high plane.

6. The fine leadership and friendly attitude of Leo Pasvolsky and his staff were indispensable to the Seminar's success. Pasvolsky's skill as a presiding officer saved the general meetings from becoming either dull or disorganized. Moreover, his genius for organization was manifest throughout the sessions. A dozen or so orchids should also be presented to John Gauge and other members of the staff.

7. Above all, I think the quality of the participants had much to do with the success of the conference. The intermingling of professors, bureaucrats, army and navy and air forces officers, business and professional men, and even a politician or two was an inspiration.

8. The fact that the Brookings Institution had funds to pay for travel expenses, board, and room of the participants should not be *de-emphasized* in any appraisal of the Seminar. Incidentally, I don't know how else the foundations can get so much for their money.

But I must go on. The lovely setting at Stanford, the hospitality of Al Eurich, the University, and the people of Palo Alto and vicinity all helped to make the Seminar memorable. And not least was the incomparable California weather! Yes, so help me, it was simply wonderful! Everything the Chamber of Commerce ever claimed, and more.

There were some weak spots. The plenary sessions were the least successful of the lot. Some participants thought there was too much of a State Department 'line' observed throughout, although I personally did not notice this. There was some criticism to the effect that the issues were not clearly or sharply enough drawn, also that the background material was too voluminous. But all this is simply to say the Seminar was not perfect. Maybe it will be next time.

Yes, I think the techniques employed could be used widely for other problems and for other groups. Brookings has made one of the most significant contributions to adult education that has come to my attention.

PETER H. ODEGARD,
University of California

OPPORTUNITIES FOR EDUCATIONAL FM STATIONS

A fact of importance to many members of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION was impressed upon your Radio Committee in the course of the 1948 Convention in Washington. If you are a departmental chairman, or a teacher of radio, who has wanted your school to apply for educational FM license, you no longer have too much time to waste. The Federal Communications Commission is under heavy pressure by commercial interests eager to take over the broadcast bands which, up until now, have been set aside for education. History illustrates that once these frequencies are taken from education to serve the needs of commerce, from that time on education will meet with little success in securing broadcasting licenses.

The SAA Radio Committee assumes that all persons interested in radio are well aware of the facts associated with the 88-93 megacycle, educational FM frequencies. It has been no secret that the FCC hoped educators would apply for FM licenses in great numbers. That they haven't would seem to be the result of budgetary problems connected with financing a $30,000 to $50,000 investment. Under the pressure of recent enrollments many schools which may have wanted the advantages of broadcasting were unable to meet the cost.

The FCC has been so sincere in its desire that education take advantage of the FM educational band that it has gone far more than half way in meeting the problems of the schools. As a result of experiments carried out in cooperation with Syracuse University the Commission has ruled that institutions may apply for special low-powered FM licenses. These low-powered transmitters have several outstanding advantages which many of our members may have overlooked.

The first advantage of low-powered FM rests in the matter of installation costs. Whereas schools have had to consider initial costs of at least $30,000, they need now consider only about $2,500. Your Radio Committee feels that many of our interested members may not have stopped to consider this differential. A second advantage lies in the fact that the FCC has made certain concessions in operating procedures, which, while sound operation is still demanded, do make it somewhat easier for beginning schools to consider broadcasting.

A third consideration may be found in the fact that there is every indication that the Commission will be favorably inclined to consider the request of a school to raise its transmission power, and hence radiated coverage, at such later date as may be economically feasible for the school. This latter consideration is the basis for the warning of this article, for the fourth factor, which

should be seriously considered by everyone interested in securing a broadcasting license, lies in the fact that the FCC has now done everything it can possibly do for educators. An educational institution can *now* reserve a broadcast license in the FM educational band. This license offers the possibility of increased transmission power when you can afford it. The Commission can do no more. If educators do not *now* apply for these frequencies the FCC will have no reason for refusing to grant them to commercial interests.

It might be well to add that it may not be too wise to consider too heavily the present small listening audience for FM. When the AM bands were open to educational institutions the listening audience in that band was also small. By the time the listening audience was full-grown, commercial interests had taken over and education could not reach its audience. History would seem to be about to repeat itself.

If you are interested in securing a license, your Radio Committee will be only too happy to make available all information possible. Write the chairman of the Association's Radio Committee. If he does not have the information in his files he will try to get it from the most authoritative source possible. However, you must act soon.

HARRY M. WILLIAMS,
Miami University

A POST MORTEM ON PRESIDENTIAL POLLS

An interesting postscript has recently been added to the articles in the October and December issues of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH on the speaking in the 1948 presidential campaign. On February 10 to 12 a group of prominent public opinion 'pollsters' and social scientists gathered on the University of Iowa campus to look critically into the whole problem of attitude and opinion research. Among the conferees were many national figures, including George Gallup, Director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, and Archibald Crossley, of Crossley, Inc. Elmo Roper was scheduled to appear on the program but unfortunately could not attend because of illness.

The poll experts posed for themselves the following difficult questions: What are the determinants of public opinion? What were the causes of the disparity between the poll findings and the November elections? Should political forecasts be made? What are the principal unsettled problems in social science research and in sampling survey methodology?

The conferees frankly admitted their past mistakes and tackled thoroughly and objectively the job of examining their assumptions and methods. One of the most encouraging features of the conference was the disposition on the part of the participants to recognize the need for basic research in all aspects of the polling problem.

The speakers attributed their erroneous predictions in the 1948 presidential race to two factors: 1. a failure to take a final poll just before the election; 2. a failure to determine who would vote and who would stay away from the polls, and where the 'undecided' vote would go.

The speakers emphasized also that the 1948 election was extremely close. Mr. Crossley declared that if slightly more than 29,000 voters in three key states of Ohio, Illinois and California had voted differently, the results of the election would have been reversed. Mr. Gallup, who missed the presidential outcome by an average of 4.7 per cent,

said that the prediction of President Truman's election in a race as hotly contested as the one last fall would have required methods with an error of considerally less than 1 per cent. He doubted if we would ever reach that level of accuracy.

Both Gallup and Crossley admitted that they had not believed that elections are ever changed in the last two weeks. They agreed also that they had mijudged the strength and rapidity of Mr. Truman's upward surge in the last few weeks of October. Gallup stated: 'We were lulled into a belief that no change is likely to occur in the last days of a campaign.' Crossley said: 'We knew Truman's popularity was on the increase, but we did not judge its speed and force.' Both men concluded that in the future they would not be justified in making election forecasts based on data secured in mid-October or earlier.

These conclusions are of interest to teachers of speech because we would like to feel that the speechmaking during a political campaign may have some influence on the election results. One of the points underlined in the December issue was that an important reason for Mr. Truman's victory was the fact that he spoke often and to many people.

Present at the conference was Samuel Stouffer of Harvard University, a member of the committee of the Social Science Research Council which issued in December a report on the 1948 election polls. While the poll experts were willing to agree with the conclusion of this committee that they had been guilty of 'errors of forecasting,' they were inclined to dispute the contention of the committee that they had committed 'errors of sampling and interviewing.' Their general argument was that we do not yet have enough data to support this conclusion. Crossley, however, recognized three possible sources of error: 1. the way questions were asked; 2. the manner of covering the rural vote; 3. failure to get far enough down the income scale in making samplings.

Much time at the conference was given over to discussion of the relative merits of 'area' and 'quota' sampling techniques. The main conclusion reached was that this problem needs intensive study. Stuart Dodd, Director of the Public Opinion Laboratory of the University of Washington, and his associate, J. T. Bachelder, described an experimental study conducted in their state last November which gave results favoring the area technique. Norman Meier, University of Iowa, reported on a 1946 study in Iowa in which the results favored the quota system.

The conferees joined in praising the Social Science Research Council for its investigation of pre-election polls and encouraged it to continue its studies. Educational institutions were urged to sponsor research in all phases of public opinion sampling.

Opinion differed as to the future of pre-election forecasting. Crossley said that his present intention was to withdraw from the election-predicting field. Gallup said that he would continue to forecast election outcomes but that in the future he would present his results differently. He felt that the poll experts had been at fault in permitting the public to arrive at the belief that polls were infallible. He said that from now on, in close elections, he would present the data and let the public make its own predictions.

It was generally agreed that the difficulties with pre-election forecasting do not invalidate other types of opinion sampling. Crossley said: 'It is right that we should predict political trends, and

how the people feel about political issues, but not the outcome of elections.' The pollsters argued vigorously that even in election predicting the results have been remarkably good. Gallup emphasized that pollsters have picked winners in 8 of the 10 elections since public opinion polling began 14 years ago. During this period the average error has been only 4 per cent.

ORVILLE HITCHCOCK,
State University of Iowa

COLLEGE THEATRES COOPERATE—THE ST. PAUL COLLEGE DRAMA FESTIVAL

The theatre directors of the four major St. Paul colleges—John Doll, College of St. Thomas; Anne Simley, Hamline University; Mabel Frey, College of St. Catherine; Mary Gwen Owen, Macalester College—with the technical directors—James Carlson, Hamline; Jerry Davis, Macalester; and associate director Hilding Peterson, Macalester—decided in 1947 to attempt to make intercollegiate cooperation as exciting as intercollegiate rivalry and to produce a spring drama festival early in May, 1948.

Because of the problems of royalty and of stage settings, and because of the acceptance of Shakespearean plays by high school and college communities, the directors decided upon a Shakespearean comedy cycle for the first festival. By mutual agreement, the Colleges of St. Catherine and St. Thomas, a women's and a men's college respectively, agreed to do 'Twelfth Night'; Macalester College 'Henry IV Part I'; and Hamline University 'The Taming of the Shrew.' We agreed that all plays were to be cut to run one and one half hours without intermission, to be keyed to a fast tempo and be as colorful and as attractive as possible.

We decided on a one unit set with four movable pillars and interchangeable doors and curtains used with two cycloramas, one black velvet and one sky blue. We agreed to build platform levels, part flexible and part permanent. All movable properties for each specific play were to be the problem of each particular production. All of us agreed to keep properties at the minimum necessary for effectiveness of production and for economy of storage space since none of our college theatres has storage space over and above the immediate needs of one production at a time.

Our drawing for location of the festival had resulted in the first one's being held in the Jeanne d'Arc Auditorium at the College of St. Catherine. Miss Frey's complete organization of the endless production details involved in presenting all three shows on the one stage on one campus will serve as a model to the hosts of future festivals. Special places were marked off for each show; and as the trucks from Macalester and Hamline arrived bearing stage properties and costume trunks for those particular shows, the various student stage crews arranged their own properties and costumes in the order of their need in the festival.

We called our experiment the 'St. Paul College Drama Festival' with the idea of being left free at future dates to present Greek or French or Spanish or American drama as the case might work out best. However, when we announced that the 1949 festival might feature Greek drama, the demand for more Shakespeare was too insistent to be ignored.

So this year, too, we will feature Shakespeare at the St. Paul College Drama Festival. Macalester will present 'Julius Caesar'; the colleges of St. Thomas and St. Catherine will present 'Romeo

and Juliet'; and Hamline University will present 'A Winter's Tale.' Hamline University will be host to the 1949 Festival; the following year, 1950, Macalester College will be host; and in 1951 the College of St. Thomas.

We hope we have proved that even without banners or chrysanthemums and the stirring rhythms of college bands, college cooperation can be an exciting and a memorable experience.

MARY GWEN OWEN,
Macalester College

A FILM REVIEW

New Voices—A Training Film in the Development of Esophageal Speech was presented by the Cleveland Hearing and Speech Center and produced under the sponsorship of the Republic Steel Corporation, Cleveland.

New Voices is a 16mm sound film which is concerned with laryngectomy and the development of a substitute voice. It is an encouraging film. It will help an individual face the laryngeal operation, when that is necessary, and it will also teach him much about the way to learn esophageal speech. The doctors, nurses, and speech therapists who work with laryngectomized patients will also find the film to be instructive.

New Voices has been produced in two versions: one for laymen and the other for those with a professional interest in laryngectomy. The former is entirely in black and white and was planned to satisfy two objectives: 1. to help an individual adjust to his particular situation when it becomes evident that his larynx must be removed; and 2. to help him with his speech rehabilitation. The professional version of the film is the same as the other except for the insertion of a sequence in color which shows a condensation of the surgical procedures used in performing a laryngectomy.

The film tells its story of hope and encouragement by presenting the experiences of a man, Tom Fuller. Tom is a pleasant-looking, middle-aged man who goes to a doctor for a sprained ankle and while receiving treatment happens to mention a hoarseness which has persisted for several weeks. His doctor refers him to a laryngologist who follows the usual diagnostic procedures and discovers that the source of hoarseness is a cancer of the larynx.

There is no time to lose; yet in the brief time between diagnosis and the necessary operation, the film shows a kind laryngologist preparing Tom emotionally and mentally for the operation and for the new voice which he will have. The doctor also teaches him the preliminary steps in the production of the belch sounds from which his new voice will be developed. The process is demonstrated and Tom is encouraged to keep practicing.

The emotional and mental fortification is accomplished in several ways. The laryngologist gives insight by explaining, verbally and with diagrams, the structural changes which the operation will produce and the inevitable alteration in breathing and speaking. Tom's morale is improved by sending him to call on a successful business man who is using the telephone when Tom arrives. He soon discovers that his new acquaintance, a Mr. Cranston, has had a laryngectomy and that the operation has not interfered with his business. Mr. Cranston opens his shirt collar and shows the tube through which he breathes.

By this time Tom fully understands the necessity for the operation, has lost his fear of it, and has started to learn a new method of speech. He is ready for the operation.

(At this point in the professional film,

the color sequence showing the laryngectomy operation is inserted.)

Tom is next seen in a hospital bed two days after the operation. He feels a little weak and his spirits are low. Mr. Cranston drops in for a few minutes, encourages him by mentioning the more than forty others in the Cleveland area who have come through the same thing and who are members of the Lost Chord Club. Tom is urged to keep trying to use his new voice.

Within a short while Tom is strong enough to go to the Hearing and Speech Center to start his speech training. The film shows a number of steps in his instructional program which extends over several weeks. He is seen listening to recordings, receiving instruction in making vowel sounds, and even speaking to members of the Lost Chord Club.

The film shifts from Tom to other members of the Club who are carrying on their businesses in a completely normal manner; a storekeeper, a service station operation, an accountant—all are shown to be as capable and efficient as before the operation.

In the final scene Tom is at his desk in his office where he faces the listener and says: 'Hello! This is Tom. Tom Fuller! Yes! How do you like my new voice? Yes, I'm back on the job now, and I don't know how to tell you what it means to me to be able to take up again just where I left off! Yes, I had a tough time, but, believe me, it was worth it to be able to come back to the old job. And thank Heaven I can talk again.'

A small booklet (3½ x 7½) has been prepared to accompany the film. Its convenient pocket size is no accidental feature. The patients will often refer to certain parts of it. The booklet contains a foreword which presents the background of the film and acknowledgements to those who have acknowledgements in its production. Other divisions in the booklet include: Suggestions for Effective Use of 'New Voices;' Foreword to the Patient; The Script of the Film, 'New Voices;' and a final section, Questions Often Asked by Persons Who are Trying to Learn Esophageal Speech. The script helps the individual recall the motion picture instruction, and the final section goes beyond the film in answering questions and giving positive suggestions about learning esophageal speech.

Most of the voicing on the film is done by a narrator. The exceptions are the esophageal voices of Mr. Cranston, Tom Fuller, and the woman instructor at the Hearing and Speech Center. These three samples increase the usefulness of the film for teaching purposes.

The professional version of the film which contains the laryngectomy operation in color gives a fine concept not only of the pre- and post-operative stages as mentioned in the foregoing account, but of the operation itself. The photographing is done from eye level and is slightly to the right of the surgeon so that a full view of the work area is available at all times. The stages of the operation are followed, with the aid of a narrator, from the administration of the anesthetic to the placement of the final stitches.

Unfortuately, the movements of the surgical team often appear jerky, due probably to photographing at silent speed and projecting with sound.

The statement that this version of the film is intended only for professional groups means exactly that. It would be most unfortunate for patients contemplating laryngectomy to see the operation sequence. It should also be pointed out that speech correction classes must be carefully prepared for the op-

eration section before seeing it. Surgical procedures can be disturbing to students who are viewing them for the first time.

There are two other comments which should be made about the film. It states in several ways that cancer is the cause for laryngectomy. Many laryngologists believe it is not in the best interest of some patients to tell them that they have a cancer.

The second comment pertains to the description of the manner in which the air is taken into the esophagus for esophageal speech. The patient is instructed to swallow air and to belch. This is a common way of describing the process. But those who have taught esophageal speech know that when the air is actually swallowed it is usually carried to the stomach and is not readily available for speech. The subjects photographed use the typical procedures of either forcing some of the pharyngeal air into the esophagus with a backward thrust of the tongue or by inhaling air into the esophagus at the moment the ordinary inhalation is accomplished. This latter procedure requires the controlled relaxation of the pharyngeal musculature, a condition which is recommended in the film.

The purchase and rental procedures are now being determined by a special committee. Information regarding the film can be obtained from the Cleveland Hearing and Speech Center, 11206 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland 6, Ohio.

PAUL MOORE,
Northwestern University

CORRECTION

The correct title of Henry Schnitzler's article appearing in the February issue should read: The Postwar Theatre in France: Books and Tendencies.

EXCERPTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The following excerpts cover transactions of the Executive Council at the 1948 convention in Washington as related to (1) committee appointments, (2) finances, and (3) proposed amendments. A complete copy of the minutes will be mailed upon request to any member of the Association.

COMMITTEES

The committee membership for 1949 is as follows. The chairman of each committee is named first; ex officio members are in italics.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES: *James H. McBurney, Horace G. Rahskopf, Rupert L. Cortright, Orville Hitchcock, E. R. Nichols, Loren D. Reid, Lester Thonssen, H. F. Harding, W. Hayes Yeager.*

FINANCE: Wilbur E. Gilman, W. Norwood Brigance, Alan Monroe, *Loren D. Reid.*

PUBLICATIONS: Donald C. Bryant, Marie Hochmuth, A. T. Weaver, *James H. McBurney, Loren D. Reid, Lester Thonssen, H. F. Harding, Orville Hitchcock.*

PROJECT COMMITTEES

STUDIES IN AMERICAN SPEECH EDUCATION: Karl R. Wallace, Warren Guthrie, Frederick W. Haberman, Barnard Hewitt, Harold Westlake, C. M. Wise.

BIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES IN AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS: Marie Hochmuth, Donald C. Bryant, W. Norwood Brigance.

CASE STUDIES IN AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS: J. Jeffery Auer, A. Craig Baird, H. L. Ewbank.

SERVICE COMMITTEES

CONTEMPORARY PUBLIC ADDRESS: A. Craig Baird, Leland Chapin, Walter B. Emery, Barnet Baskerville, William A. Behl, Harrison B. Summers, Ernest Wrage, Lionel Crocker.

INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATE AND DISCUSSION: Lionel Crocker. (Delta Sigma Rho, Pi Kappa Delta, Tau Kappa Alpha, and Phi Rho Pi name two members each to this committee. The chairmanship rotates among societies.)

INTERNATIONAL DEBATE AND DISCUSSION: Brooks Quimby, Richard Murphy, Glen Mills, John V. Neale.

NATIONAL DISCUSSION FOUNDATION: John Keltner, T. Earle Johnson, Alan Nichols.

Study Committees

History of Speech Education: Giles W. Gray, John Dolman, Jr., Wilbur E. Gilman, Mary Margaret Robb, Lester Thonssen, Russell H. Wagner, Bert Emsley, Karl R. Wallace, Ota Thomas Reynolds, Alexander Drummond.

History of American Public Address: Bower Aly, A. Craig Baird, W. Norwood Brigance, Dallas C. Dickey, H. L. Ewbank, Roy C. McCall, Horace G. Rahskopf, Lester Thonssen, Russell H. Wagner, Karl R. Wallace, W. Hayes Yeager, Marie K. Hochmuth, Ernest Wrage, George Bohman, J. Jeffery Auer, Donald C. Bryant.

Problems in the Elementary School: Elise Hahn, Margaret Parrett, C. Agnes Rigney, Lorna Shogren Werner.

Problems in the Secondary School: Ruth Thomas, Karl Robinson, C. W. Edney, Virginia Sanderson.

Problems in Colleges and Universities: Robert Clark, David Phillips, Robert Huber, P. Merville Larson.

Problems in Graduate Study: Howard Gilkinson, A. T. Weaver, H. P. Constans, Milton Dickens.

Problems in Theological Seminaries: Charles A. McGlon, Batsell Barrett Baxter, Joseph G. Brin, W. C. Craig, R. A. Johnson, S.J., John L. Casteel, Clyde Yarbrough.

Problems in Drama and the Theatre: C. R. Kase, F. Loren Winship, W. P. Halstead.

Problems in Interpretation: Charles Green, Wallace A. Bacon, Mary Margaret Robb, Sara Lowrey.

Problems in Radio: Harry M. Williams, Hale Aarnes, Armand L. Hunter.

Problems in Motion Pictures: Earl Wynn, Kenneth Macgowan, Buell R. Whitehill, Jr.

Problems in Television: Paul Rickard, Earl H. Ryan, Harrison Summers.

Problems in Communication: Wesley Wiksell, Paul D. Bagwell, Franklin H. Knower, H. P. Constans, Ralph Nichols, Paul McKelvey.

Problems in Speech Science: Mack D. Steer, John Black, John Snidecor.

Problems in Phonetics: Jane Zimmerman, C. M. Wise, C. K. Thomas.

Problems in Speech Correction and Pathology: Claude Kantner, Wendell Johnson, Elvena Miller.

Problems in Audiology: Grant Fairbanks, Raymond Carhart, Darrel J. Mase.

Problems in Microfilm and Microcard Materials: George Bohman, Barnet Baskerville, Myron Phillips, Lester Thonssen.

Finances

The 1948-1949 budget was increased from $29,600.00 to $37,910.00. The budget for publications was increased from $11,050 to $13,250,—the principal items of increase being an additional $1,800 for the *Journal* and an additional $500 for the *Directory*. The budget for printing and mimeographing was increased from $2,135.00 to $3,385.00, the principal items of increase being an additional $400 for new solicitations and an additional $650 for convention printing. Remaining items on the budget were increased from $16,415 to $21,275,—the principal items of increase being an additional $1,175 for postage; an additional $550 for clerical help; an additional $350 for convention expense; an additional $500 for commissions; and an additional $1,050 for office equipment. The executive secretary was instructed to withhold these additional funds if reduced income made such withholding necessary.

A budget for 1949-50 was adopted, calling for total disbursements of $39,210. The items of increase over the 1948-49 budget are: an additional $200 for the *Journal*, an additional $600 for *Monographs*, an additional $200 for the *Directory*, and an additional $300 for special printing, the total additions being $1,300.

Budget for 1949-1950

Publications:		
Quarterly Journal	$ 8,900.00	
Monographs	2,600.00	
Directory	2,400.00	
Special Printing	600.00	
Repurchases of old copies	150.00	
		$14,650.00
Printing and Mimeographing:		
Stationery	$ 900.00	
New solicitations	800.00	
Renewals	200.00	
Placement	250.00	
Convention	1,200.00	
Sustaining members	35.00	
		$ 3,385.00

Postage	$ 2,500.00
Clerical expense	6,400.00
Officers and committees	4,350.00
Bank charges	65.00
Binding	800.00
Office expense	800.00
American Council on Education	100.00
ASHA share of convention fees	500.00
State and regional association dues	350.00
AETA share of convention fees	300.00
Social security taxes	110.00
Insurance	50.00
Convention expense	950.00
Depreciation of equipment	230.00
Secretary's bond and audit	100.00
Commissions and discounts	1,000.00
Office equipment	1,700.00
Reserve fund	500.00
Contingency	370.00
Total	$39,210.00

Proposed Amendments to the Constitution

Article IV, Officers: Substitute the words "Editor of Speech Monographs" for "Editor of Research Studies."

Article V, Duties of Officers, Sec. 7: Substitute the words "Editor of Speech Monographs" for "Editor of Research Studies."

Article VI, Executive Council, Sec. 1: Substitute the words "Editor of Speech Monographs" for "Editor of Research Studies."

Proposed Amendments to the By-Laws

Article III, Election of Officers, Sec. 5: Substitute the words "Editor of Speech Monographs" for "Editor of Research Studies." Sec. 7: Substitute "Editor of Speech Monographs" for "Editor of Research Studies."

ANNUAL TOTALS OF ATTENDANCE AT CONVENTIONS, 1920-1948

1920	Cleveland	*
1921	Chicago	*
1922	New York	115
1923	Cincinnati	175
1924	Evanston	216
1925	New York	177
1926	Chicago	314
1927	Cincinnati	212
1928	Chicago	354
1929	New York	400
1930	Chicago	508
1931	Detroit	430
1932	Los Angeles	378
1933	New York	443
1934	New Orleans	385
1935	Chicago	914
1936	St. Louis	659
1937	New York	935
1938	Cleveland	803
1939	Chicago	1001
1940	Washington, D. C.	906
1941	Detroit	699
1942	Chicago	394
1943	New York	359
1944	Chicago	543
1945	Columbus	574
1946	Chicago	1268
1947	Salt Lake City	669
1948	Washington, D. C.	1374

* No record

REPORT OF REGISTRATIONS, WASHINGTON, D. C., 1948

Alabama	12
Arkansas	6
Arizona	1
California	35
Colorado	11
Connecticut	17
Delaware	12
District of Columbia	135
Florida	27
Georgia	8
Illinois	82
Indiana	38
Iowa	26
Kansas	12
Kentucky	8
Louisiana	23
Maine	11
Maryland	58
Massachusetts	36
Michigan	80
Minnesota	21
Mississippi	3
Missouri	39
Montana	1
Nebraska	6
New Hampshire	7
New Jersey	28
New York	217
North Carolina	12
North Dakota	3
Ohio	98
Oklahoma	15
Oregon	4
Pennsylvania	111
South Carolina	6
South Dakota	9
Tennessee	21
Texas	22
Utah	5
Vermont	5
Virginia	36
Washington	9
West Virginia	17
Wisconsin	27
Wyoming	1
Canada	11
England	1
Honolulu, Hawaii	1
	1,374

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

DOUGLAS EHNINGER, *Editor*

LITERARY HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES. Edited by Robert E. Spiller, Willard Thorp, Thomas H. Johnson, and Henry Seidel Canby. Associates: Howard Mumford Jones, Dixon Wecter, and Stanley T. Williams. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948; pp. (Vols. 1 and 2) xx+1422; (Vol. 3) xxii+817. $20. (Vol. 3, *Bibliography*, available separately, $7.50.)

In his recently published *Theory of American Literature* (a lively and scholarly appraisal of the histories and interpretations of American writing) Howard Mumford Jones tells in fascinating detail the story of the long and shameful neglect of American literature by American colleges and universities. Before the Civil War our institutions of higher learning were too preoccupied with the study of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin to consider seriously a national culture which did not reach its first fine flowering until the period from 1830 to 1860; after the Civil War, although freed from the rigors of a strictly classical curriculum, they were too devoted to an Anglophile tradition and to Germanic standards in scholarship to discover the importance of contemporary American writing. As late as 1872, Professor John S. Hart of Princeton became an American pioneer by teaching the first collegiate course in the national literature. His good example was not widely imitated. Throughout the last third of the nineteenth century and the first third of the twentieth, in most colleges and universities, the departments of English, many of them large enough to assign an eminent scholar to every major writer and period in British literature, were usually satisfied to offer either nothing whatsoever in American literature or at best an elementary survey to which one professor of English devoted a third of his time. 'William B. Cairns at the University of Wisconsin,' says Professor Jones, 'seems to have been the sole professor of American literature in the country until 1917, when Fred Lewis Pattee was granted a similar title at Pennsylvania State College, thus increasing by 100 per cent the number of chairs specifically devoted to the national letters.' (p. 161)

Professor Pattee's appointment was one indication of a change for the better in the academic climate of opinion toward American literature. The three volumes of *The Cambridge History of American Literature*, the work of fifty-six distinguished teachers, scholars, and critics, appeared in 1917, 1918, and 1921. The brilliant success of Vernon L. Parrington's *Main Currents in American Thought* (1927-1930) with the general public and with professors of history, philosophy, political science, and sociology shamed and embarrassed conservative professors of English by proving that other scholars found high values in what they had so long viewed with indifference or contempt. The number of scholarly articles on American writers and writings began to increase and multiply. In 1929 members of the Modern Language Association interested in

American studies founded *American Literature,* a quarterly magazine of American literary research, the first of its kind in the country. Since then the amount of scholarly work in American literature has been so great, and its general quality so high, that Professor Jones was justified at the time he finished his *Theory of American Literature* in looking forward to the appearance of the 'quasi-official' *Literary History of the United States* with the happy expectation that its editors and contributors would avoid the mistakes of their predecessors, profit by the scholarly labors of the past thirty years, and provide an altogether satisfactory ending to an important epoch in American scholarship.

The *Literary History of the United States* has now appeared. Six years, according to the 'Preface,' were spent in its preparation. During the first year seven men—the four editors and the three associates—drew up the design, assigned the chapters to themselves and to forty-eight additional contributors, presented each contributor with an outline of the work and a statement of principles, and held a long series of conferences with the contributors, individually and in groups. The next three years were spent in writing, and the last two years in editing and publishing. The 'almost ideal' conditions under which the *Literary History* was planned, written, edited, and published (including payments to the contributors) were made possible by the cooperation and aid of The Macmillan Company, the Rockefeller Foundation, the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Philosophical Society, Swarthmore College, Princeton University, the University of Pennsylvania, and the Lawrenceville School. Truly, the preparation and publication of the *Literary History* is impressive proof that American literature has reached a new high point in its Age of Academic Respectability. What is the measure of the work itself?

In quantity the *Literary History* is short of monumental. Its text is somewhat longer (about 20 per cent) than the texts of its most influential predecessors, the *Cambridge History* and Parrington's *Main Currents,* which are nearly of a size. This is a seemingly substantial increase in size, but it must be remembered that Parrington died before he had completed his design and that the *Cambridge History* stops short of the second greatest period in American literature. The text of the *Literary History* contains a little over twice the number of words in the text of Moses Coit Tyler's *Literary History of the American Revolution,* a study confined to the twenty years from 1763 to 1783, and something less than twice the number of words in the text of Alexander Cowie's recently published *Rise of the American Novel,* which carries the detailed study of its subject only through the novels of Henry James. To survey English literature in a period of a hundred years (1780-1880) Oliver Elton needed more space (about 10 per cent) than the editors of the *Literary History* have devoted to their subject; Douglas Southall Freeman needed more space (about 20 per cent) to tell the story of R. E. Lee, and even more to record the war-time activities of Lee's lieutenants. Carl Sandburg painted his picture of Abraham Lincoln's war years on a canvas almost exactly twice as large as that of the *Literary History.*

How large a canvas the editors of the *Literary History* needed for their own conception of a proper 'definition of our literary past' is evident from the definitions of literature, of literary history, and of American literature set

forth in their 'Address to the Reader.' Their definition of literature is the broadest possible.

> Literature . . . as the term is used in the title of this book . . . is any writing in which aesthetic, emotional, or intellectual values are made articulate by excellent expression. It is the record of man made enduring by the right words in the right order. . . . Literature . . . has been magnificently used by Americans . . . in the service of history, of science, of religion, or of political propaganda. It has no sharp boundaries, though it passes through broad margins from art into instruction or argument. (pp. xvi-xvii)

In practice, the editors often find it convenient to relax the provisions of even this loose definition. Valuing 'integrity and power' more highly than 'the right words in the right order,' they allot eleven pages to Theodore Dreiser, of whose style Robert Spiller writes: 'As a style, in the formal sense, it never developed at all. . . .' Their definition of literary history is equally broad. 'History,' they tell us, 'as it is written in this book will be a history of literature within the margins of art but crossing them to follow our writers into the actualities of American life.' (p. xvii) And, indeed, literary history as it is written in this book does touch upon, and include portions of, almost every other kind of history. Finally, their definition, if such it can be called, of American literature increases their need for an immense canvas. The editors propose to strike a balance between those first historians of American literature who wrote of it 'as if they were describing transplanted English flowers and trees' and those later historians (Parrington?) who discovered its democratic differentiations but 'left unemphasized' its 'timeless values.' 'It may enlighten the reader,' they write, 'to think of American literature as the record and analysis of a series of cultural waves beating in from across the Atlantic to our shores in a continuous series and changing their form and nature and sometimes their direction as they sweep over the New World.' (p. xviii) Obviously, this way of thinking commits the editors to a task roughly twice as great as the task of the earlier historians whom they criticize as one-sided. Facing the task of living up to their definitions and to the astonishing list of promises (too long to quote) recorded in Section 5 of the 'Address to the Reader,' the editors might well have echoed the cries of Herman Melville as he wrote *Moby-Dick:* 'Give me a condor's quill! Give me Vesuvius' crater for an inkstand! Friends, hold my arms!'

The disparity between the design of the editors and the actual size of the text inevitably affects the quality of the *Literary History*. Its scope is not exhaustive. *The Diary of an Impressionist*, by Lafcadio Hearn, who 'was never at home in America,' is given two pages of notice, but the *Personal Memoirs of U. S. Grant* is not mentioned, although it is a part of American literature by standards stricter than those of the editors. The *Cambridge History* offers a separate chapter on Joseph Smith's *Book of Mormon* and Mary Baker Eddy's *Science and Health;* the *Literary History* discreetly consigns both to the limbo of the *Bibliography*. Edward Taylor, the Puritan Poet (1664?-1729), whose poems remained in manuscript until some were published in 1937 by one of the editors, receives a generous two pages, but the books of Louisa M. Alcott are consigned to the *Bibliography*. Frank Stockton and Bret Harte are discussed at some length, but O. Henry is mentioned as an author who has been a favorite not only with the Russian 'masses but also with many of the Soviet writers.'

The treatment of the American public speakers is a much better illustration of how inadequate magnitude affects the quality of the *Literary History*. 'The Orators,' twenty-two pages in length, by Harold F. Harding, Everett L. Hunt, and Willard Thorp, is a well written, straightforward, informative chapter, one of the best in the text. It sums up three centuries of 'a proud American tradition,' linking Thomas Hooker's sermons with Franklin Roosevelt's First Inaugural. It mentions the major speakers in this tradition, and offers pointed but much too brief analyses of the rhetorical art of Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Abraham Lincoln, Edward Everett, Theodore Parker, William Jennings Bryan, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt.

'The Orators' is supplemented in the *Bibliography* by a well organized section on 'Oratory and the Lyceum' (pp. 233-9), which is divided, from the beginnings to 1820, into subsections on Oratory and Debating, and from the mid-nineteenth century on, into subsections on the Rostrum, the Pulpit, the Bar, the Platform, the Lyceum, and History and Criticism. In addition, Beecher, Calhoun, Clay, Hooker, Lincoln, Parker, Webster, and Wilson are included in the alphabetized list of individual bibliographies (pp. 371-790).

The text of the *Literary History* contains a few other passages of interest to teachers of speech. Pages 22-3 contain information on public discussion in the colonies; page 605, a comment on the 'superb versified oratory' of Lowell's 'Commemoration Ode'; pages 801-3, information on lecture clubs and lecturers from 1868 to 1893; page 921, comment on Mark Twain as lecturer; page 1018, information on the Boston School of Oratory; page 1123, information on Chautauqua reading circles; pages 1177-8, comment on Vachel Lindsay's speaking style in relation to his poetry; pages 1194-5, comment on the conversational tones of Robert Frost's poetry and on his imitation of New England speech; page 1289, comment on the eloquence of Harry Emerson Fosdick. Several of the chapters—particularly those on Jonathan Edwards, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Walt Whitman, and Mark Twain—contain implicit evidence of the influence of public speaking on major American writers. This evidence might easily have been amplified into a major aspect of American literary history, an aspect immensely more deserving of explicit and separate treatment than, for example, 'The Indian Heritage,' which we are told, at the end of nine pages (694-702), has largely 'remained unassimilated and even unknown' by the white people in America.

Why, in the judgment of the editors of the *Literary History*, do three centuries of 'a proud American tradition' deserve less space than is given to Henry Adams, or to the expatriate Henry James, or to folklore, or to humor? Is this judgment determined by recent scholarly fashions and interests? Or by lingering traditions? A passage in 'The Orators' may point to the answer:

> in the years between 1865 and 1912 . . . admiration for the art of oratory declined year by year. Professors of Rhetoric and Oratory in the colleges were looked upon as little better than teachers of elocution. . . . Their once proud profession was despised by their academic colleagues. The college debating societies . . . fell to low esteem. . . . (p. 561)

These were the years during which, according to Professor Jones, the Anglophile tradition and the Germanic spirit in scholarship caused the neglect of American literature. They also caused the neglect of public speaking. 'Not to "speak well" but to be "well read," '

writes Professor Jones, 'became the dominant cultural aim, and in the light of this more sophisticated ideal, the old patriotic glow began to dim its ineffectual fires.' (*The Theory of American Literature*, p. 96)

But even if the editors had allotted to the American orators, and to the influence of public speaking on American writing, the greater proportion of space in the text which their importance in our history calls for, would the results have been altogether satisfactory? Could a definitive treatment of these subjects be compressed into fifty pages, or into seventy-five, or into a hundred? *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*, in two volumes edited by William Norwood Brigance, contains more than two-thirds the number of words in the text of the *Literary History*, and consequently can allot to Daniel Webster more than twice the space which the *Literary History* gives to all literary aspects of public speaking.

The treatment of the orators in the *Literary History* is one illustration of a general weakness. On almost every subject included in the *Literary History* —on individual writers as well as on kinds of literature and aspects of American history—the reader can find something which is better because it is longer. In some instances, articles on minor figures in such reference works as the *Dictionary of American Biography* are more informative than the text of the *Literary History*. In other instances, the contributors to the *Literary History* are the authors of longer and better works on their subjects. In brief, in so far as quantity affects quality, the *Literary History* is in the awkward position of being neither elementary nor advanced. In view of their loosely defined aims and long list of intentions, the editors could have avoided this unfortunate result only by executing their grand design on a truly monumental scale.

Does the *Literary History* possess a central coherence which outweighs its quantitative inadequacy? Its editors believe that it does. They maintain that they have joined the individual contributions 'to one another within a frame' and that the result is a 'coherent narrative.'

The first test of a coherent narrative is readability. Many parts of the *Literary History* make fascinating reading. Such chapters as Howard Mumford Jones's 'The European Background,' Tremaine McDowell's 'The Great Experiment' and 'In New England,' Eric Goldman's 'The Historians,' Odell Shepard's 'The New England Triumvirate: Longfellow, Holmes, Lowell,' Harold W. Thompson's 'Humor,' Willard Thorp's 'Defenders of Ideality,' Wallace Stegner's 'Western Record and Romance,' Robert Spiller's 'Henry Adams,' Henry Steele Commanger's 'The Hope of Reform,' Joseph Wood Krutch's 'Eugene O'Neill,' and Brand Blanshard's 'Speculative Thinkers' are deserving of the highest praise. Other readers will have other favorites. As a whole, however, the *Literary History* falls far short of the standards of readibility set by Tyler's gracefully written literary histories and by Parrington's brilliant *Main Currents*. The effect on one who follows the text from page 1 to page 1391 is wearying. Some chapters are disappointing, though no other is so woefully inadequate as 'Philosopher-Statesmen of the Republic,' which disposes of the Declaration of Independence, the main source of the distinguishing traits of American literature, in a few uninspired sentences. But the chief cause of the reader's weariness is the necessity of wading through an endless 'series of cultural waves' while

enduring a barrage of 'aesthetic, emotional, or intellectual values,' not all of them 'made articulate by excellent expression.'

The main faults of expression in the *Literary History* culminate in the unrestrained fury of passages too long to quote, but it is possible to arrange under headings a few of the minor distractions.

A. Sage comments on simple subjects:

He [Theodore Dreiser] knew the United States because he had lived in it. (p. 1198)

himself a sailor and a man, Cooper could delineate a man of the sea. (p. 262)

B. 'The right words in the right order'?

In the authentic idiom of American thought and speech the statesmen of the greatest experimental democracy in history put pen to paper. (p. 151)

About the sexual make-up of Mark Twain speculation has been indulged since the Freudian era. (p. 923)

C. Influence of subject on style?

Gertrude Stein was said to have said. . . . (p. 1300)

Behind him [Sidney Lanier] pressed ever near time's winged chariot; he knew the doomed mortal's craving for multiform experience. Though we may shake our heads over his cloying extravagance. . . . (p. 902)

D. Overloaded sentences, declarative and interrogative:

We shall show that American literature differs from all the modern literatures of Europe in that it depends both upon an imported culture and upon the circumstances of a New World radically different in human experience from the Old, and thus has a quality which will presumably be characteristic of the literature of the future in a world society more mobile and yet more integrated than our own. (pp. xix-xx)

Is there not the recriminatory violence of one Maule, and the minatory apostrophe of lonely Judge Pyncheon? (p. 81)

E. Vague figures of speech instead of precise statements:

Without Coleridge the romantic movement in America would not have had the shape by which we know it. (p. 324)

The voice, through these many American years, is the voice of Hawthorne, and Melville, and Emerson, and Whitman, and Adams. But the hand is the hand of Jonathan Edwards. (p. 81)

F. Disturbing literal overtones of words used figuratively:

At the same time the Revolution, the frontier, and the sea crossed and recrossed one another in these and other tales; and through them all crackled the fire of Cooper's criticism of America. (p. 254)

In brief, the real meaning of Emily Dickinson's poetry must reside in its inner record of an elevated human spirit suffering, battling, growing toward a victorious purgation. (p. 913)

These are minor defects. The major weakness in the *Literary History* is its lack of a consistent point of view and a standard of values. As a guide in the realms of ideas and values, a corporation is a poor substitute for the integrity of a single mind. Every human mind—even the greatest—has the limitations inherent in individuality, but we can quickly discover the serious limitations of an individual and take them into account in our reckoning. As Bacon observed, truth comes out of error more readily than out of confusion.

In their eagerness to present a 'coherent narrative,' the product of a 'genuine collaboration,' the editors have resorted to a mechanical device which will prove a nuisance to most readers, and which is indicative of the underlying tragic flaw of the *Literary History*. The names of the seven editors and associates appear on each title page, and the names of the editors, the associates, and the forty-eight additional contributors are inscribed in the simple dignity of alphabetical order on a page facing the title page in Vols. 1 and 2. The chapters in the text are unsigned, and the 'Contents' does not show who wrote the separate chapters. At the end of the text, however, a special 'Table of Authors' makes

this information available to the curious. Consequently, any one who wishes to know, while reading Vol. 1, who it is who thinks that Emerson's *English Traits* and *The Conduct of Life* are his 'two ripest and roundest books,' or who it is who thinks that Melville's *Billy Budd* is more tragic than his *Moby-Dick*, or who it is who thinks that Whitman's 'Song of Myself' is an expansionist poem, must turn to pp. 1393-6 in Vol. 2 for the answers.

Readers can save time by writing in the names of authors at the headings of chapters. This practice also helps to dispel the dangerous illusion that the opinions in the text are detached, impersonal, and quasi-official verdicts. The names of the authors remind us that the *Literary History's* Emerson is Spiller's Emerson, that its Melville is Thorp's Melville, that its Whitman is Canby's Whitman, and that its 'frame,' designed to unite the separate contributions into a coherent narrative, is mainly the work of seven men, who, like Parrington, are distinguished but nevertheless self-appointed and fallible interpreters of American life and literature.

All things have the defects of their qualities. Parrington's *Main Currents* is a brilliant, readable, and immensely stimulating individual performance, but it is criticized in the *Literary History* for its author's 'somewhat forced effort to relate all that is good in the American present to the ideas and accomplishments of Jefferson.' The *Literary History* does not attempt to relate all that is good in the present to the ideas of Jefferson, but it clearly reveals, in spite of mechanical devices, its own central flaw—its lack of a consistent point of view and a standard of values. This flaw may be a symptom of our times, a manifestation of the tendencies toward institutionalization and collectivization which Malcolm Cowley describes in Section 4 of Chapter 75 in the text (pp. 1270-2). As illustrations in his account of how American writers live in our own times and of how American writing during the 1940's has become increasingly the work of corporations rather than of individuals, Cowley cites the bureaucratic methods used in preparing Hollywood scripts and articles for such magazines as *Time*, *Fortune*, and *Reader's Digest*. The methods which he describes are nearly parallel to the methods of editing and collaborating described by the editors in the 'Preface' of the *Literary History*. His concluding remarks may serve, therefore, as a judgment: 'there was a tendency to forget that, although a great book expresses a whole culture and hence has millions of collaborators, including persons long since dead, in another sense it must finally be written by one man alone in his room with his conscience and a stock of blank paper.'

Are we to conclude that collaboration in the writing of literary history is a questionable undertaking? As evidence bearing on the question, the *Literary History* seems to indicate that on the *impersonal level of factual description* collaboration could be altogether successful. If its fifty-five authors had chosen to work together on an informative manual of American literature—with a complete rather than a 'selective' bibliography, with descriptive chapter headings, with adequate indexes, and with a scope and a consistent schematism which would make it possible for the reader to find desired information—their competence would have guaranteed a performance approaching perfection.

The *Literary History* seems also to indicate, however, that on the *level of values and ideas* collaboration in writing *is* a questionable undertaking. Its

definitions of literature, of American literature, and of literary history are so flabby as to be well-nigh worthless. It fails to apply a consistent standard to the growing number of American writers who present a tragic view of life. In its preoccupation with influences, foreign and domestic, it often fails to estimate properly the power of the individual human spirit to be an original force, a first cause uncaused of ideas and values. It fails to stress the true glory of great American literature, namely, the part it plays in shaping the values which we defend in the present world crisis. In view of the individual abilities of its distinguished company of authors, we may reasonably ascribe many of these shortcomings of the *Literary History* to the limitations inherent in collaboration.

HENRY ALONZO MYERS,
Cornell University

HERMOGENES. DE STATIBUS. Edidit Georgius Kowalski. Travaux de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Wroclaw, Seria A., Nr. 1. Wratislaviae, 1947; pp. lxxxii+72.

This little volume appears to provide us the first definitive edition of a genuine work of Hermogenes. The lengthy prolegomena and the elaborate critical apparatus indicate a piece of painstaking and tedious research. For this edition the editor himself did much of the *Vorarbeit* (cf. p. ix and revs. CW, 33.(1940).214, Murphy/AJPh, 64.(1943).346, Solmsen); into it he put the fruits of a lifetime spent in classical scholarship. To appreciate his accomplishment we must view it in its historical perspective.

In 1913 Hugo Rabe of Hannover published in the Teubner series a preliminary edition of the body of texts commonly received as the rhetorical art of Hermogenes; it included the five treatises:

1. *Peri Ton Staseon* (On Stases of Disputes)
2. *Peri Heureseos* (On Invention)
3. *Peri Ideon* (On Types of Style)
4. *Peri Methodou Deinotetos* (On the Method of Effectiveness)
5. *Progymnasmata* (Elementary Rhetorical Exercises)

Rabe's edition, in the main, established the texts as directly transmitted in the 132 accessible manuscripts dating from the tenth to the fifteenth century. He was cognizant of the fact that no final edition could be made until the mass of commentaries to the texts and the more recent manuscripts had been examined critically and made available so that the indirect transmission might also be duly reflected. Radermacher (Pauly-Wissowa VIII, 877) predicted that this would prove to be a most arduous task.

For textual and other reasons Rabe, in his Preface, rejected as definitely non-Hermogenean and spurious the *Progymnasmata* and the *De Inventione*. (The genuine *Progymnasmata* are presumed to be lost.) In *On the Method of Effectiveness* Rabe discovered parts genuine and parts spurious. As authentic works of Hermogenes he acknowledged only the two: *On Types of Style* and *On Stases of Disputes*.

In 1947 George Kowalski, pro-rector of the Polish University of Wroclaw (former German University of Breslau), an eminent Polish classicist and life-long student of Greek rhetoric in general and of Hermogenes in particular, published his edition of Hermogenes' *De Statibus* with complete critical apparatus incorporating as far as it pertained to this treatise the arduous tasks Radermacher had anticipated.

In comparing the texts of the two editions this reviewer found few, if any, significant variations, but as Kowalski points out in his Introduction, the commentaries establish certain readings more firmly and the more recent manuscripts shed interesting light on the text in its influential *Nachleben*. In view of the scope of the materials investigated, Kowalski's edition of *Peri Staseon* may be considered definitive.

He dedicated his work to the sacred memory of the twenty-four professors and teachers of the University of Luow and the ninety-five members of their families who had fallen victims to the atrocity of the Nazi gestapo. Kowalski himself died shortly after his volume had been published; hence this edition is his ultimate contribution to rhetoric, to Poland, and to liberty.

The brief treatise *On Stases of Disputes* has shared in the prolific influence which Hermogenes has exerted on rhetorical theory through many centuries. No translation in any modern language seems to be available today. A scholarly English translation of Kowalski's edition would be highly desirable.

OTTO A. DIETER,
University of Illinois

THE GAY COUPLE IN RESTORATION COMEDY. By John Harrington Smith. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948; pp. xi+252. $3.50.

The Gay Couple, engaging in a love duel with witty talk and florid manners, is the subject of Professor Smith's persuasive investigation. He examines Elizabethan comedy to find beginnings of the love duel, particularly in Shakespeare, Beaumont, and Fletcher. With the Platonic formula disposed of, he devotes an interesting chapter to the Gay Couple itself. Then the gradual decline of the pair is considered with a significant discussion of the forces of romantic and domestic-intrigue comedy in opposition before 1690. Such 'sympathetic' trends put the gay hero and heroine on the defensive with the result that the pair were displaced by the man and woman of 'sense.' The study ends with an interesting statement on what Mr. Smith calls 'exemplary comedy' of the early eighteenth century.

The book, for the most part, presents little that is new. The opening chapters, dealing with the rise of the pair, offer an interesting summary. Some fresh material is introduced in tracing the early opposing trends before 1690, while the discussion from 1690 onward presents the well-known forces which defeated the couple. It is with Chapter 3 on Gay Comedy that this review is concerned.

The author's thesis seems to be this: The readers of Restoration comedy appear to have misjudged the gay pair by failing to view them sympathetically. For them, Professor Smith has 'a genuine regard.' He believes that attacks against the morals of the couple have misfired because critics have failed to recognize the obvious point, namely, that the pair were playing a game, that the code required that 'one must never admit being serious.' But beneath the witty exchange and the superficial regard for standards was a seriousness. 'It may be doubted,' he says:

> that any period ever took love more seriously than this one, or thought more seriously about marriage, the degree of its seriousness being measurable by the misgivings with which young people in the plays become conscious of their attraction for each other, their struggles to escape the net, and, at the end, the mixture of anxiety and studied insouciance with which they accept the result.

In line with this seriousness, 'the virtue of the heroine in Restoration comedy is always above reproach. Virtue, to be sure, is not required for heroes: the period was as insistent on the "double standard" as any other has been.' Obviously the end of all this seriousness led eventually to marriage.

The position which Professor Smith has taken runs afoul when brought into line with two considerations: Restoration life, marriage customs, manners, and the techniques of the Restoration theatre. His 'genuine regard' for the couple may have developed from his having adopted a literary rather than a theatrical approach. Much theatrical criticism, particularly in connection with Shakespeare's characters, has followed the line of extracting characters from their environment and their theatre and of viewing them in isolation. Soon they become something else. Persons in a play belong to that play with its period characteristics. Nothing else matters. Speculations beyond the play may be interesting to engage in, but they hardly belong to the theatre.

Restoration audiences viewing a play could hardly have allowed sympathy to enter into their reactions in the theatre any more than they did in Court life. Modern spectators have to be geared to the same harness to grasp a Restoration play.

In his final chapter Professor Smith has made a reasoned analysis of the falling off of the hero and heroine because of the inclusion of 'good sense.' Had he included an equally good critique with Chapter 3, the Gay Couple might have been kept within the theatre.

JOHN H. MCDOWELL,
Ohio State University

THE COMMUNICATION OF IDEAS. Edited by Lyman Bryson. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948; pp. ix+296. $3.50.

Growing concern with the problems involved in the communication of ideas and their relevance to the attainment of domestic and international peace and understanding is evidenced by numerous articles, essays, and books currently appearing on the subject. On the heels of Schramm's symposium, *Communications in Modern Society*, comes Lyman Bryson's collection of addresses called *The Communication of Ideas*. This volume is based principally on a series of lectures delivered at the Institute for Religious and Social Studies, a graduate school at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York City. Fourteen authors representing diverse fields of inquiry ranging from anthropology to Greek, to business make contri-

butions. They include Lyman Bryson, Margaret Mead, Whitney J. Oates, Harold D. Lasswell, Wendell Johnson, Irving Lorge, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Robert K. Merton, Lennox Gray, Leo Nejelski, James M. Clarke, Charles A. Siepmann, Robert D. Leigh, and Joseph M. Goldsen.

Drawing upon her knowledge of communication habits in the primitive Manus, Arapesh, and Bali cultures, Margaret Mead brings her customary insight to a discussion of Some Cultural Approaches to Communication Problems. Study of primitive societies often yields remarkable analogies to behavior patterns in our own society. Dr. Mead comes up with the delightful comparison between Walter Winchell's use of Flash! and the furious drumbeats of the Arapesh designed to arouse 'a state of readiness of excitement, a mixture of fear, dread, anxiety, and pleasant expectation . . . before any information is given or any action sought' (p. 12). Whitney Oates has a ten page discussion of classic theories of communication, relying mainly on Plato's ideas as expressed in the *Gorgias* and the *Phaedrus*. Lasswell's essays, The Structure and Function of Communication in Society and Attention Structure and Social Structure, the expression of one of the most searching theorists of our times, struck this reviewer as especially rich in ideas. His analysis of the attention structure of each social class, particularly of the 'elite of power,' clarifies the question of censorship and attempts at censorship in all societies at all times.

Wendell Johnson's chapter Speech and Personality presents a general semantic approach to communication problems by reducing the communication process 'to a series of stages, defined in terms of the functions and possible disorders occurring at each stage' (p. 78). Lazarsfeld's and Merton's chapter Communication, Taste, and Social Action, written with remarkable clarity, impressed this reviewer as an excellent study of social concern with the mass communication media. The authors note that 'in view of the present organization of business ownership and control of the mass media,' communication channels 'have served to cement the structure of our society. . . . Thus, the very conditions which make for the maximum effectiveness of the mass media of communication operate toward the maintenance of the going social and cultural structure rather than toward its 'change' (pp. 117-8).

Leo Nejelski, president of Nejelski and Company, Inc., writes on the subject Communication in Practical Affairs, an area of activity he seems to equate almost entirely in terms of business affairs and mostly large-scale business, at that. With an enthusiasm that may not be shared by everyone, he conjures up the vision of business practices when television is perfected. 'Imagine the possibilities for hurdling distances,' he writes, 'when the boss can sit in his office and yet be heard and seen by every person in offices and plants' (p. 153).

James M. Clarke's chapter Science and Writing starts out optimistically with the assertion that science can provide us with what the literary approach to writing (which calls for studying 'the products of writers rather than the processes of writing') has hitherto failed to unearth: the secret of how to write well. But, twenty pages later, he reluctantly concludes that 'It is not likely that a scientific knowledge of the processes of communication will make writing a simpler or an easier task' (p. 175). The exasperated and disheartened reader is obliged to conclude that literary or scientific schemes will never help him get a sentence on paper, but will probably be of great assistance to him in improving and refining the sentence once it has been put down.

Charles A. Siepmann's chapter Radio is a thoughtful presentation of the social responsibilities of broadcasters and listeners; Robert D. Leigh's Problems of Freedom, drawn largely from his work as director of the Commission on Freedom of the Press, discusses the 'relation of the principle of freedom of utterance, a basic value in our democratic theory, to our highly organized system of mass communication built on the model of modern business organization' (p. 197). Chapters by Bryson on Popular Art, by Goldsen on Leadership, Science, and Policy, by Gray on Communication and the Arts, and by Lorge on The Psychologist's Contribution complete the book's offerings.

One may legitimately ask, I think, for what audience this book was prepared and what function it is intended to serve, beyond that of indicating communication is an important and involved subject studied by scholars from many disciplines. There is no obvious coherence or unity to the general discussion. The essays bear no particular inter-relationships, except Margaret Mead's two papers which, for some unfathomable reason, are separated from each other by ten intervening chapters, the same treatment being accorded to Lasswell's two papers. One is almost inclined to suspect a trace of sadism in an editor who would suffer a reader to digest Lasswell's scheme of analysis and then deliberately insert some two hundred pages of diversionary material before

printing Lasswell's follow-up essay. No chapter seems long enough for the writer to feel entirely free from the pressure of space limitations to develop a sustained discussion of his ideas. In almost every instance the writer employs a special terminological framework which serves mainly to bewilder the general reader who no sooner masters the 'biological equivalencies' of Lasswell when, fifteen pages later, he must deal with Wendell Johnson's 'hypertonic avoidance reactions,' and subsequently with Mead's 'self-maximating competitive national units.' Dr. Johnson's statement that 'the language used in the present discussion . . . is probably lacking more in simplicity than in complexity, generally speaking' (p. 66) is a cautious statement wholly imbued with truth and characteristic of much of this volume. It seems to me that readers who are equipped through training to understand fully each author will be dissappointed by the brevity of the discussions, while the readers who might be satisfied by the discussions would not be prepared to understand them. One wonders whether each writer has tackled the problem of communicating his ideas about communication with the same tenacity and verve he has displayed in analysis and breadth of concept.

This reviewer noted several typographical errors: 'The Communications Act of 1943' should read '1934' (p. 182) and the 'Senate's Temporary National Economic Committee reported in 1946) should read '1940' (p. 246).

GIRAUD CHESTER,
Cornell University

ACOUSTIC PHONETICS. By Martin Joos. Language Monograph No. 23. Linguistic Society of America. Baltimore: Waverly Press, Inc., 1948; pp. 136. $4.50.

The spectrograph is one of the instruments by which speech has been made visible by Bell Telephone Laboratories. Presumably it is soon to become generally available, and, among the electronic aids to the teacher or researcher in speech, promises to be second in importance only to recording and reproducing of sound. Already a general description of the apparatus and its operation is available. (Ralph K. Potter, George A. Kopp, and Harriet C. Green, *Visible Speech*. New York, 1947.) One machine is at the University of Michigan for trial and evaluation; others are being used by the services. Professor Joos had access to one of these over a considerable time, and here presents a primer to accompany a study of its output. This is not an operation manual. Not at all. Rather it offers nomenclature and description for the visible product of the spectrograph, and a background for an understanding and interpretation of the array of lines and patterns that will confront the user. The explanation accompanies a good deal of hypothesizing about phonetics, some of which is quite valuable apart from a discussion of the instrument that prompts it. The five chapters into which the monograph is divided will be discussed individually.

Harmonic Analysis and Basic Acoustic Treatment: There is nothing new here. Miller gave a good explanation of harmonic analysis in 1915. (Dayton C. Miller, *The Science of Musical Sounds*. New York, 1937) Jeans did equally well. (Sir James Jeans, *Science and Music*. New York, 1938.) Even so the material is appropriate in this discussion, and Joos' exposition is particularly clear. An understanding of harmonic analysis is basic to intelligent use of the spectrograph (and helpful in working with any acoustical gadget in the classroom or laboratory). Some years ago when teachers of public speaking laid claim to the field of speech they obligated themselves and their successors to understand and incorporate in their curricula some core subject-matters beyond rhetoric. One of these, perhaps the essential feature of the larger area, was the study of speech sounds, and as developments have carried us along a focal point in this study has become *frequency* or cycles per second (c.p.s.). Joos, a worker in language, accommodates the Linguistic Society—a group of non-technical experts who also work with speech—by obligingly explaining *harmonic analysis*.

Further Acoustic Theory and Basic Vowel Theory: In this section Joos proposes that the puff or explosion with each opening of the vocal cords lasts about 1/50 (in some cases 1/20) centisecond (1/100 sec.) During the utterance of a vowel, for example one spoken at 100 c.p.s., the cords are closed (while expiratory pressure is building up against them) 49/50 and open 1/50 of the total time. I believe that photographic evidence does not bear out this notion, and support, if available, from the spectrograph is not presented. In any event, the discounting of the vibrating-string conception of vocal-cord action is salutary.

Second, quality (timbre) is denied as a descriptive term to explain the vowel—this on the basis that a vowel loses its distinguishing characteristics when reproduced, phonographically at some (r.p.m.) other than the one used in recording. Contrariwise, the recorded trombone

remains a trombone in timbre, irrespective of the operation of the playboy. Therefore, Joos uses *vowel* color to describe the former and *timbre*, the latter. Admittedly *quality* or any synonym is confusing when applied both to voices (orotund, breathy, etc.) and vowels, in spite of the fact that this is general practice. Joos' *vowel-color* appears not to be ultimately helpful, although it may last.

The vowel is an auditory experience that needs an acoustical definition, not an analogy from vision. The confusion is not semantical. Two phenomena of resonance (*filtering*, to Joos) occur simultaneously. Neither is perfectly analagous to a musical event, much less to visual experience. The oral, muffled, or pectoral voice is heard only when saying a vowel-like sound. Either the voice or the vowel must change concomitantly with variation of the resonating (filtering) system. The listener hears a qualitative change. Or the viewer sees an altering pattern on the spectrograph—a qualitative modification, be it of voice or vowel. One teacher's way of making vowel quality vivid was to speak of the *i*-ness or *o*-ness, etc. of the particular vowel under discussion. This terminology at least emphasized the acoustical nature of the sound. *Vowel-color* does not.

Third, two formants or regions of resonance are alleged to be the basic characteristics of each vowel. (Harvey Fletcher, *Speech and Hearing*. New York, 1929.) This is now almost traditional vowel-theory and an improvement over the one-time notion that the most open vowels have only one formant. However, some investigators —indeed several—have established the presence of more than two although not the importance to perception of the third, fourth or fifth formant in any vowel. The fact that in on-going speech the formants typically vary in frequency during the saying of a vowel has been recognized for some time (cf. Steinberg, Lewis, Talley, Black). Joos adds a method of noting these formants graphically. It is an ingenious plan, perhaps the best yet. He uses logarithmic graph paper and plots the frequencies of the formants for the duration of the vowel. However, the technique is limited to plots of two formants. (Two may be enough for vowel recognition either heard or viewed on the spectrograph. They are an incomplete translation of the *vowel* and the *speaker*, but two are as many as are carried by the telephone.)

Finally, in this chapter the author risks a correlation between kinesthetic articulatory patterns and listening patterns on one hand and patterns in mental activity on the other.

Indeterminancy and Perception: The time lag in communicaton by voice is a plaguing characteristic in systems and circumstances where immediacy is of the essence. Whether the delay is more with the sender (that is, with talking) or with the listener (perception) remains to be settled. Different laboratories are looking into the problem with a hope of speeding up message transmission. Professor Joos in effect lumps together speaker and listener delay with the term *smear*, a period of indeterminancy. This usually lasts 1/20 sec. and accomodates both the tolerance of listening and the physiological movements of talking. Perhaps Joos' generalization that effective communication is limited to about twenty speech sounds per sec. may be valid. There is some a priori evidence to support it. I suspect individual differences. For example, a wave-to-wave harmonic analysis of repeated pronunciations of a word showed that one speaker always said 5-7 periods (sound waves) before the typical formants of the vowel appeared. Other speakers achieved these formants in a single period. Also, the natural durations of different vowels vary. Possibly the lengths of smears also differ among vowels. In any event, Joos poses interesting speculations all amendable to definite answers, and his answers may be the right ones.

Consonants and Minor Vowel Features. The author makes pointed references to details of the ten spectrograms in the book. The section merits careful study. It may be a model of the type of analysis that will ultimately make up a term paper—this when the spectrograph is available for class use.

Segmentation and Decomposition. Finally Joos extends acoustic phonetics to mean all of speech: 1. brain activity and innervations to the speech mechanism, 2. acts of articulation, 3. sound, 4. hearing, 5. perception—the whole encompassed by language. This is remindful of Bott's causal series. The topic is broad and is not amenable to exactness and brevity at the same time. However, some aspects are established in Joos' few pages; for example the movement or progress of speech in time is aptly emphasized, and the inevitable overlapping of bits of speech, e.g., the effect of a consonant on a vowel. The author hypothesizes that the blending or slurring of sounds in sequence is less a matter of dynamics (currently supposed in treatments of assimilation) than of overlapping neural innervations. This is short of the mystical, although difficult to establish. It raises important questions relevant to clinical procedures and learning to speak languages.

I undertook with a great deal of enthusiasm the assignment of reading *Joos* for review. The book promised to be unique, a blending of traditional and experimental phonetics with tomorrow's device for the classroom and laboratory—the spectrograph. In large measure the monograph fulfills this expectation. Certainly it is required reading for one who plans to use the spectrograph. Beyond this it is provocative with regard to phonetic theory. Disappointment arises from the many allegations about the nature of speech that are left unsubstantiated. I am reminded of an executive of whom it was said: 'He has 100 ideas an hour. If he only hits 1 per cent right he is still immeasurably valuable.'

A final note, slightly complaining: to date, Joos included, visible speech seems to have cast a spell over those who have worked with it. In their awe they write: 'Isn't it wonderful!' Could it be that a careful researcher was right who said in early 1946: 'It [visible speech] will be helpful in a clinic but no definite research will come of it.' I optimistically wait, believing that the machine will be highly valuable.

JOHN W. BLACK,
Kenyon College

LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE DISTURBANCES. Aphasic Symptom Complexes and Their Significance for Medicine and Theory of Language. By Kurt Goldstein. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1948; pp. xii+374. $8.75.

Characterized by a fundamentally eclectic approach coupled with an insistence that problems of language not be over-simplified and understudied, Goldstein's new book is indispensable for the speech pathologist who would attempt to understand and to work with patients who have linguistic disturbances. From the first words of the Preface, the author makes it increasingly apparent that he is a Gestalt psychologist with a bias in the direction of general semantics and that he believes no study of parts can be made without a consideration of the relationship of the parts to and in the whole; that ground and figure cannot be separated; that concrete and abstract attitudes must always be differentiated meticulously. This point of view is expressed succinctly:

> Experience showed that I must free myself from any definite theory and investigate patients in a way as unbiased from any of them as possible. . . . This becomes still more evident if one is interested in the question of spontaneous restitution and retraining of lost capacities. Here only a detailed analysis of the individual defect, with the aid of psychology, even philosophy of speech, will furnish a reasonable basis for management . . . a clear evaluation of the results gained with psychologic methods requires consideration of the relation of speech disturbance to our concept of brain function in general, to the premorbid constitution of the individual, to the personality as a whole, to the modification of all these factors by pathology, to the patient's capacities outside of speech, whether they are undisturbed or damaged, etc., and finally to the situation in which the individual has to live.
>
> From the foregoing it will be evident that it is impossible to consider knowledge gained from separate viewpoints separately; one cannot restrict oneself to such narrowly acquired material even for such special purposes as retraining. The various facts elucidate each other. Even a simple examination presupposes some sort of theoretic concept and still more so does retraining. In scarcely any field of medicine are theory and practice so closely related, and support and correct each other to such a degree as in the field of speech disturbances.

This scholarly and well documented volume in which Goldstein says he tries to combine the methods of 'empiric research' and 'philosophic reasoning' is divided into two parts, one dealing with theoretical concepts of language and language disturbances, the other with clinical aspects and retraining of aphasic patients. Part 1 includes four chapters, and Part 2 is presented in six divisions.

Chapter 1, titled The Problem of the Origin of Symptoms in Brain Damage, is extremely practical and helpful to the speech correctionist because it points out in excellent detail that in aphasia the same symptom may be produced in totally different ways and that retraining is dependent not upon the symptom observed but upon the factors acting to produce the symptom or symptom complex. A classification of symptoms according to their origins and an explanation of symptoms in terms of their origins are presented ably. Symptoms are classified as direct, indirect, or depending; as symptoms due to catastrophic conditions and symptoms due to fatigue or perseveration. In discussing these symptoms and their origins, Goldstein lists six general rules of disintegration that operate in brain-injured patients; these

include a rise of threshold of excitation, and increasing lability of threshold of excitation, abnormal spread and duration of excitation (perseveration), increased determination of an organism's performance by external factors, a blurring of the ordinarily sharp boundaries between figure and ground, disturbance (sometimes inversion) of the figure-ground relationship. Goldstein in this chapter differentiates concrete from abstract attitude; he describes abstract attitude as characterized by the individual's ability to exercise initiative, to make choices, to react simultaneously to various aspects of a situation, to analyze and to synthesize, to think and to perform symbolically, to detach his ego from the outer world. According to Goldstein, aphasics are impaired in all facets of the abstract attitude. The discussion of fatigue included in the section of this chapter devoted to symptoms due to fatigue and perseveration is particularly interesting when it is read in conjunction with the chapter entitled Fatigue Syndromes in Norman Cameron's *The Psychology of Behavior Disorders* (New York, 1947). Goldstein concurs with Cameron when he writes: 'Subjective and objective fatigue sometimes may occur independently of each other. . . . Fatigue is related to distress; it is behavior in distress.'

In Chapters 2 and 3, Goldstein explains his interpretation of the application of the organismic approach to brain pathology in general and to aphasia in particular. Briefly, the organismic approach is one which takes into account the functioning of an entire organism; it is the approach of the Gestalt psychologist. When behavior is studied from this viewpoint pathologic behavior becomes 'behavior of functions of parts of the organism isolated from the whole.' This chapter is a splendid one for the student of language development and linguistics as well as for the speech pathologist. It deals with the purpose of language and the problem of meaning, concrete and abstract language, disturbances of language caused by pathology, normal language development, similarities between the development of language and defects in aphasics and, finally, a somewhat repetitive adaptation of the organismic approach to the study of aphasia. Probably the chapter may best be summarized in Goldstein's own words: 'Language is used by the individual as a means of coming to terms with his environment and of realizing himself. . . . The symptoms (disturbed language) are an expression of the organism's struggle with the defect in its attempt to adjust itself in spite of some interference by the defect.'

Included in Chapter 4, Survey of the Various Forms of Disturbance of Language in Pathology, are discussions of fifteen forms of disturbed language; especially useful for the speech pathologist are the sections dealing with rational and emotional language, disturbances of inner speech, disturbances of 'intelligence,' disturbances of reading and writing, disturbance of language in polyglot individuals, and examination procedures. This chapter, particularly tends to indicate that Goldstein either is unfamiliar with or discounts much of the work that has been done by Americans in the field of asphasia from 1890 until the present time. For example, he fails to recognize the contributions of J. M. Nielsen to the solution of the problems of nomenclature. Perhaps it is to be expected that Goldstein's own European training and experience combine to make him more aware and appreciative of the work done in Germany, Italy, France, and England than of that undertaken in the United States.

The six chapters of Part 2 are case reports accompanied by notes on the pathologic anatomy involved in each case, by suggestions for treatment in each instance, and an additional discussion of treatment for all types of language-disturbed patients. This entire section is of real value to the speech correctionist in helping to differentiate among the various aphasic types. Most significant in the sections on treatment is the reiterated premise that therapy must be determined by a study of theory and by the origin of the symptoms rather than by the symptoms themselves.

Goldstein expresses in his Preface the hope that he will be able 'to present those speech disturbances observed in lesions of the brain cortex in a form useful both for practical and theoretic purposes in the clinic' and that he may do so in appropriately balanced fashion. This objective he has achieved. His shortcomings are those which he himself suggests in his concluding remarks: the inability of one person to be familiar with all the work in the field; the difficulties encountered in explaining in clear language the 'vexing phenomena of speech pathology' (and this must be difficult indeed for one writing in other than his native language); failure to use as much material from other authors as would have been 'desirable,' leading this reviewer to the perhaps unwarranted assumption that Goldstein does not question his own findings as rigorously as he

questions those of other workers in the same field.

In conclusion, the author writes: 'such a work as the present volume can be only a step toward the final understanding of individuals suffering from language disorder.'

It is a long step and one well taken.

JEANETTE O. ANDERSON,
Rockford College

A GUIDE TO PUBLIC OPINION POLLS. By George Gallup. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948; pp. xxiv+117. $2.50.

This little book ought not to be classified as fiction, despite the low esteem in which opinion polling was held by many persons after the fall election. It contains a useful elementary exposition of a method of objective measurement in the social sciences.

The 1944 edition consisted of eighty questions and answers classified under twelve headings. In the current revision there are eighty-five questions and answers in thirteen categories. Although there have been some significant revisions which will be noted later, there are many identical items in the two editions. Practically no changes are observable in the sections titled Function of Public Opinion Polls, Size of the Sample, Interviewers and Interviewing Problems, Polling Accuracy, Interpretation and Reporting of Results, Significance of Public Opinion Poll Results, Polling and Process of Democracy, and Miscellaneous Problems of Public Opinion.

However, The Cross Section, which is the third group of questions and answers, has been improved through the addition of important, elementary explanations of random, stratified, area, quota, and pin-point sampling. As Hugh Parry observed in the *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 'Gallup's reasonably balanced comparison of the area and quota-control techniques will probably not please zealots in either camp, but it should satisfy those who are more interested in shedding light than heat on the controversy.'

In The Problem of Questions there have been revisions of some consequence also. The 'different ways of putting questions' has been developed into the 'Quintamensional' plan of question design. This change, which is more than nominal, brings the material abreast of current practice in question design. A second change in this section consists in the addition of an attempted refutation of Kornhauser's charge that polls are unfair to organized labor. In this reviewer's opinion, Gallup loses the argument. A third change concerns the use of attitude scales, but not much is made of this item.

The section titled Polling Accuracy remains basically unchanged, probably because it was written prior to November, 1948. A postponement of the revision would have resulted in some modification of the assertations that polling accuracy has 'definitely improved over the period of the last twelve years' and that the error in the next decade 'probably will not fall below 2 per cent.'

In defense of polling organizations it should be pointed out that interviews cost money and that a vast increase in the number of interviews results in a slight reduction in the standard error. For instance, in 5,000 interviews the standard error is .7 per cent and the range of variability is 62.1—57.9 per cent; while in 10,000 interviews the standard error is .5 per cent and the range of variability 61.5—58.5 per cent. Last fall several persons apparently thought this small gain in accuracy was not worth the cost.

In Election Predictions we encounter closely related questions. Gallup points out that unless a candidate gets 53 per cent or more of the two-party vote, his victory in terms of popular votes cannot be forecast with complete certainty. Truman received slightly less than 53 per cent. Further, the 1948 revision states that the division of the electoral vote cannot be predicted because 'close' states cannot be polled with a standard error as low as .2 per cent. Published analyses have shown that a shift of forty thousand votes in Illinois, Ohio, and California would have given Dewey pluralities and enough electoral votes to win.

Despite these facts, say the critics, the polls should have indicated the closeness of the election. They are part of a twenty-five-million-dollar-a-year industry which has lost a decade in public confidence. Gallup was about 10 per cent high on Dewey and correspondingly low on Truman. Roper, who confidently picked Dewey in August, fared even worse. The 'scientific' pollsters doubtless noted with chagrin that a 'pullet poll,' based upon the labels on chicken feed sacks which twenty thousand Midwestern farmers bought, showed Truman ahead 54 per cent to 46 per cent in September.

Measurement of the Intensity of Opinion deals with the same question in both editions. The expanded answer in the revision reports the more recent studies in this field. The fact remains that intensity is an important factor which is not yet being measured satisfactorily by polls.

The final section, Polling in Foreign Countries, sets out two questions which indicate polling is being carried on abroad.

In sum, this book is a useful elementary reference work.

GLEN E. MILLS,
Northwestern University

MODERN ENGLISH AND ITS HERITAGE. By Margaret M. Bryant. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948; pp. xii+407. $5.00.

Some ten years ago I ran into my good colleague, Professor Matthews, in the halls of U.C.L.A. 'Will,' I said, 'I've just covered the history of the English language in one hour for my course in phonetics.' 'Good,' he replied, 'I've just covered phonetics in one hour for my course in the history of the English language.'

The ratio is just about right, but it is dictated by the exigencies of the curriculum, not by good sense. Any course in descriptive phonetics which uses English as its sole or principal material must take into consideration some part of the phonological development of English. Any such course informed by an idea larger than that of rudimentary prescription ought to make sure that students have a fairly extensive and altogether sound knowledge of how English got to be what it is, in its whole linguistic pattern and not merely in its phonology. A single lecture is, of course, not enough. Yet the hours available are limited and, if the course is to deal adequately with its own content, the instructor can hardly afford one lecture, certainly not more on what Jespersen so well labeled 'the growth and structure of the English language.' What we need is a single book to which students could be referred. It is from this point of view, it seems to me, that a book with the promising title *Modern English and its Heritage* ought to be reviewed for readers of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH. I doubt that this is the book we have been looking for.

It seems to be, in spite of a statement to the contrary in the Preface, a book specifically for a course in the history of the language, and it looks like the outgrowth of a specific course. Witness the division into forty-seven chapters, of uneven length, two to twenty-one pages, and some of such curious combination or division as to suggest no other principle of distribution than cutting up into convenient teaching bits. The chapters are subdivided by section captions which sometimes outline the chapter structurally and sometimes merely mark paragraph breaks, e.g., 'Lungs and Diaphragm' for a paragraph in which neither is mentioned, and the meaningless 'Other Extreme.' Witness the apparatus for the student at the end of each chapter, taking up one quarter as much space as the actual chapter text. There are from five to near thirty 'readings' per chapter. There are in all 750 questions or subjects 'for class discussion' and 310 'suggestions for research papers,' seven of the latter 'very broad subjects and suitable for extended research projects such as the M.A. or Ph.D. thesis.' Witness the multiplicity of lines which might well have served the purpose of the moment in a lecture and have not been disciplined for publication: the note that F. P. Adams of the recent Information Please was once F. P. A. of the old *New York World;* two widely separated references to Swift's *Proposal,* titles differently punctuated and the dedicatee differently named, one reference dated and not footnoted, the other footnoted and not dated, and no cross reference; the introduction of the highly technical term *Sememe,* which might have given a fillip to a lecture but serves no purpose, no use being made of it, here.

This is no place to deplore the current fad of textbooks in the form of lecture notes and teaching syllabi. Without raising the question of their desirability for the courses they are adapted to, we can take it for granted that such books are not likely to be of much use as collateral reading for other courses.

Independently of this presumption of unsuitability, the book has two specific shortcomings—both in part two, The Speech Sound and the Letter: Units of Oral and Written English—which make it less than useful for our purposes. The portion on descriptive phonetics is not systematic or sound or clarifying or even consistent with itself. The portion on Old and Middle English sounds and on changes in the sound system is inadequate both in coverage and accuracy. The teacher of phonetics might instruct students not to read the former portion and so avoid calling their attention to manifest contradiction of current phonetic theory except that the latter portion is based upon and in part incorporated in the former. It is obvious that the most immediate utility of such a reference work as we have in mind is in its treatment of earlier phonological systems and the development from earlier periods to our time. That treatment must be unquestionably sound, absolutely accurate within the limits of attainable accuracy, and adequate in coverage. The treatment here is none of these.

While the chapters on the alphabet in part

two and other parts—The Heritage of Modern English, Grammar and Usage, and Word Formation—contain a great deal of interesting and useful information, the treatment is not of uniform excellence, nor is it so systematic or clear that this book can be said to answer any of our needs.

LEE S. HULTZEN,
University of Illinois

REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN SPEECHES: 1947-1948. Selected by A. Craig Baird. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1948; pp. 260. $1.50.

Representative American Speeches: 1947-1948 consists of five parts: an essay titled How Shall We Judge a Speech? introductory notes for each address, the speeches themselves, brief biographical notes, and a cumulated author index covering this volume and its predecessors.

Professor Baird in making a simple list of his thirteen steps in rhetorical criticism—originality of authorship, textual accuracy, social and political background, audience, classification by occasion and purpose, evaluation of the ideas and the arguments, adequacy of support, skillful and ethical use of emotion, organization, language usage, delivery, *ethos,* and general effectiveness—places clarity and simplicity above logical consistency. Some may question whether this organization and format may not mislead the unwary. The thirteen points *appear* to be equally important and logically coordinate; they *appear* to be equally applicable to every speech. The author seemingly thought that the risk of such a misunderstanding was worth taking.

The introductions to the separate speeches are masterpieces of pertinent writing. Material which is merely interesting is rigorously omitted; therefore, the items which pose the historical setting and which point to the distinctive rhetorical factors stand out.

Particularly interesting and informative are the introductions which contain terse, first-hand reports on delivery and methods of preparation. If such material can be secured for even more of the speeches in the succeeding volumes the reader will profit. Of course, as much as we may wish for it, the editor cannot hear all of the speeches that he is going to include; but perhaps more use can be made of the first-hand reports of other observers.

The main part of the book is the nineteen addresses or speech programs. They are grouped under eight headings—international policies, atomic energy, labor and the cost of living, national defense, the political campaigns, education and civilization, personalities, and religion. The period covered is June 9, 1947 to May 17, 1948.

The following statements summarize the reactions of this reviewer: 1. The collection, because of the variety and the competence of the addresses, provides the basis for a useful course in either speech composition or rhetorical criticism. Almost every speech type and rhetorical principle is illustrated. 2. The speeches of a nation vividly and accurately portray its political and cultural history. Students of public address have always known this; other readers of *Representative American Speeches* can hardly escape reaching the same conclusion. 3. Our age is one of amazingly rapid change. Some of the addresses, particularly those on foreign policy, refer to conditions that already seem to belong to a different age. 4. The speeches of 1947-1948 were ones of competence rather than greatness. Great speeches come from problems that are both dramatic and well understood. In 1947-1948 these two requisites did not exist. 5. The printed page can never adequately present a speech, which is a living document compounded of speaker, audience, and occasion. Explanatory notes may help to reduce the seriousness of the difficulty, but they cannot remove it. And most important, 6. *Representative American Speeches: 1947-1948* refutes the notion that almost anyone could compile a worthwhile anthology. It is the discriminating judgment and the firm editorial hand of Professor Baird that render this volume useful.

WAYNE N. THOMPSON,
Chicago Undergraduate Division,
University of Illinois

THE ADVERTISING AND BUSINESS SIDE OF RADIO. By Ned Midgley. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1948; pp. xi+365. $5.35.

The Advertising and Business Side of Radio by Ned Midgley is a book about the radio 'business' written by a 'business' man—a man whose experience and general background justify his writing such a text. Many educators consider it to be unfortunate that not all other writers on the subject of radio have been so careful in this respect. Mr. Midgley is certainly to be commended for sticking to the field about which he is so eminently qualified to write. The result is an important addition to literature in the field of commercial radio broadcasting, for this book is an unusually comprehensive treatment of the business aspects of radio and contains a great deal of current, interesting, and informative material. From its pages the reader should

derive a thorough understanding of the radio industry, how it functions, and how it is financed.

It is probably true that a critical scholar might find Mr. Midgley somewhat of a propagandist in behalf of commercial radio broadcasting and suggest, therefore, that his writing and research lack what we like to think of as true academic impartiality. Such an observation, however, does not materially detract from the excellent manner in which the book achieves its stated objectives. At the outset the author announces that 'Our system of broadcasting must be recognized first as a commercial enterprise dependent upon advertising revenue for its very existence.' The publishers recommend the book as 'a basic text for courses dealing with such business aspects of radio as time buying and broadcast procedures.'

Thus, there seems to be little question as to what sort of a book the author intended to write. The difficult problem arises when one attempts to evaluate this book for teachers of speech. First, it is clear that Midgley does not pretend to concern himself with traditional liberal arts values. For this reason, his book will gain little acceptance from the teacher who refuses to grant the premise that a study of the commercial side of radio broadcasting has a legitimate place within the college curriculum. This teacher will acknowledge that 'Scant attention has been paid to broadcasting as a business,' and will contend that even 'scant attention' is not properly the concern of the teacher of speech. This view is no criticism of Mr. Midgley's text, but it does suggest serious limitation in its use.

Further, regardless of speculation as to the cultural and artistic merit of this book, it must be noted that it has been adopted already by a considerable number of important schools and is being used as a text both in departments of business and of speech. This fact appears to indicate that, in any event, some teachers of speech consider the business side of radio to be a valuable part of the training program in their schools.

Finally, it must be remembered that a recent survey conducted by the radio study committee of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA reports that very few schools are currently offering courses in such areas as sales and management where this book might well be considered a satisfactory text.

For these reasons, it must be concluded that although Mr. Midgley has written a distinctly superior book covering an area about which he is well qualified to write, he may find many teachers of speech praising his book while seldom using it.

PAUL RICKARD,
Wayne University

BRIEFLY NOTED

PATTERNS IN MODERN DRAMA. Edited by Lodwick Hartley and Arthur Ladu. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1948; pp. vi+496. $4.00

MODERN AMERICAN PLAYS. Edited by Frederic G. Cassidy. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1948; pp. viii+501. $3.50.

Patterns in Modern Drama is a well edited and attractively printed anthology of seven plays selected as representative of the main currents in drama from Ibsen to the present day. Designed especially for college students on the freshman and sophomore levels, the collection includes 'An Enemy of the People' (Realism), 'Uncle Vanya' (Naturalism), 'The Pigeon' (Fantasy and Comedy of Ideas), 'The Emperor Jones' (Expressionism), 'Craig's Wife' (Problem Play), 'The Male Animal' (Farce and Satire), and 'The Little Foxes' (Melodrama).

Each play is prefaced with a short introductory essay discussing its place in modern drama. A chronology of the principal events in the life of the author and a short bibliographical note are also provided.

Modern American Plays is announced as 'a representative selection from the best of contemporary American drama.' 'Anna Christie,' 'Abe Lincoln in Illinois,' 'Waiting for Lefty,' 'Winterset,' 'Watch on the Rhine,' and 'Life With Father' are the plays presented. Each has been chosen as illustrative of a particular dramatic type or of a recent experiment in dramatic writing. Appended to the plays are selected critical comments from contemporary reviews and essays. These, it is hoped, will be useful in stimulating class discussions.

UNIVERSITY DEBATERS' ANNUAL, 1947-8. Edited by Ruth Ulman. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1948; pp. 325. $2.50.

The transcripts of eight intercollegiate debates and one radio forum discussion are presented in this thirty-fourth volume of the *University Debaters' Annual* series. An outline summary of the arguments and a selected bibliography accompany each debate.

IN THE PERIODICALS

GIRAUD CHESTER, *Editor*

RHETORIC AND PUBLIC ADDRESS
WINSTON L. BREMBECK
University of Wisconsin

RADIO AND TELEVISION
GIRAUD CHESTER
Cornell University

DRAMA AND INTERPRETATION
HUGH Z. NORTON
University of Michigan

LANGUAGE AND PHONETICS
HAROLD WEISS
Southern Methodist University

SPEECH SCIENCE
JOHN V. IRWIN
University of Minnesota

THE TEACHING OF SPEECH
GIFFORD S. BLYTON
University of Kentucky

PSYCHOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY OF SPEECH
JACK MATTHEWS
University of Pittsburgh

RHETORIC AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

BLUMER, HERBERT, Public Opinion and Public Opinion Polling, *American Sociological Review*, 13 (October 1948).542-54.

This article presents observations on the nature of public opinion and on public opinion polling as currently performed. The author's discussion is followed by critiques given by Theodore M. Newcomb and Julian Woodward.

CANTRIL, HADLEY, A.B. BLANKENSHIP, and GEORGE HORSLEY SMITH, The Opinion Polls and the 1948 U.S. Presidential Election: A Symposium, *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research*, 2 (Fall 1948).309-31.

Noted students in the field of public opinion add significant comments to the mounting appraisals of opinion polls and their relationship to the 1948 presidential election.

EMPSON, WILLIAM, Emotions in Words Again, *The Kenyon Review*, 10 (Autumn 1948).579-601.

'The question how Sense and Feeling are related in a piece of literature is one that critics need to come back to at intervals; perhaps in the abstract it is insoluble, but nearly all criticism and most writing take a vague theory about the matter for granted, and if we try to think about the abstract question we may at least clarify our own practice.'

FREELEY, AUSTIN J., Public Relations in Tournament Debating, *The Gavel*, 31 (November 1948).9-10.

'All too often the organization of a tournament is so complex to the uninitiated that the student body of the host college, inadequately informed as to the proceedings, loses interest and fails to support the affair.' The author reports a tournament organized to eliminate such criticism of tournament debating.

HUDSON-WILLIAMS, H. L. L., Thucydides, Isocrates, and the Rhetorical Method of Composition, *The Classical Quarterly*, 42 (July-October 1948).76-81.

Was Isocrates influenced by Thucydides? The author attempts to answer this question by comparing certain prose examples from each writer.

MILLER, HARRY L., How the Film Aids Discussion, *Film Forum Review*, 3 (Fall 1948).3-8.

This article reports a study of film forum projects made by the Film Laboratory of the Institute for Adult Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. The study 'undertook observations of a number of film forum programs in the New York area with the purpose of determining what, if any, observable effects the showing of a film had upon subsequent discussion.'

NAEGELE, KASPAR, Praise and Condemnation of Propaganda, *Public Affairs*, 11 (July 1948).153-7.

The author discusses the place of propaganda in modern society and reviews the case study of Kate Smith's persuasion marathon in selling war bonds on 23 September 1943.

NEUBERGER, RICHARD L., Confessions of a Candidate, *The Progressive*, 13 (January 1949).20-2.

Elected to the Oregon State Senate by the largest total vote ever polled by a candidate for the Oregon legislature, the author gives some interesting observations on the campaigning techniques of Dewey, Truman, and himself.

O'Brien, Joseph F., An Appraisal of Contemporary Forms and Phases of Forensics in Pennsylvania, *Bulletin of the Debating Association of Pennsylvania Colleges*, 15 (10 December 1948).32-45.

The author appraises forensics in Pennsylvania colleges under four main heads: forms of organized presentations, after-presentation procedures, debate tournaments, and the student legislative assembly.

Ratcliffe, S. K., President Truman's Triumph, *The Contemporary Review*, 174 (December 1948).321-6.

The author offers further explanations of the presidential election of 1948. 'Thomas Dewey, a proved vote-getter on his own ground, is the first political campaigner to exploit all the resources of mechanism in an untrammelled popular election. The contest of 1948 will be remembered for this display and its spectacular failure, and for the contrast between the two contestants.'

Scott, Kenneth, Press Opposition to Lincoln in New Hampshire, *The New England Quarterly*, 21 (September 1948).326-41.

The author reports the attacks made on Lincoln as a speaker and as a man by the opposition press in New Hampshire.

Sollmann, Mary A., Electioneering—Then and Now, *The Classical Journal*, 44 (December 1948).189-94.

In an election-conscious year, the author gives an interesting comparison of the electioneering customs in the Republican era of Rome (with special consideration given to Cicero) and those of the present time.

Stratton, Ollie, Techniques for Literate Listening, *The English Journal*, 37 (December 1948). 542-4.

Current interest in the teaching of listening is given consideration. The author discusses the importance of teaching listening and reports lesson plans designed to teach listening skills.

Taggart, Harold F., Thomas Vincent Cator—Populist Leader of California, *California Historical Society Quarterly*, 27 (December 1948). 311-7.

In the first of two articles, the author begins a discussion of another leader and orator in the Populist Movement. At a Fourth of July celebration in 1890, Cator's oration, as the writer quotes, 'was received with a warmth and heartiness of approval not often accorded to the glowing and exalted nonsense of orators of the day.'

Titus, Charles H., The Two Major Conventions in 1948, *The Western Political Quarterly*, 1 (September 1948).252-60.

Students of the stratagems of political conventions will be interested in the author's analysis of the two major conventions of 1948.

Wadsworth, Moses Goodwin, Some Memories of Lincoln, *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, 41 (September 1948).281-2.

This hitherto unpublished memoir of a man who saw and heard Lincoln, though very brief, is of some value when most information about the Great Emancipator has been written and rewritten for almost three generations.

Young, James Harvey, A Woman Abolitionist Views the South in 1875, *The Georgia Historical Quarterly*, 32 (December 1948).241-51.

A Quaker abolitionist from Philadelphia, Anna Elizabeth Dickinson, had emerged from obscurity in 1862 to win renown as an oratorical 'Joan of Arc,' and later as the 'Queen of the Lyceum.' The author reports the eventful lecture tour this abolitionist made into the South in 1875.

Young, Kimball, Comments on the Nature of Public and Public Opinion, *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research*, 2 (Fall 1948).385-92.

The author provides provocative explanations of the nature and elements of public opinion.

RADIO AND TELEVISION

Aylesworth, Merlin H., Men, Mikes, and Money, *Collier's*, 121 (17 April 1948).13-5, 65ff.; (24 April 1948).26-7, 96-7; (1 May 1948).68-72; (8 May 1948).30-9.

A romanticized narrative by a former NBC president highlighting key figures and incidents in radio's early years.

BAILEY, S. F., Radio for Children, *Theatre Arts*, 32 (February 1948).74-5.

An appraisal of the B.B.C.'s Children's Hour.

BRAGG, SIR LAWRENCE, Lecturing to an Unseen Audience, *The B.B.C. Quarterly* 2 (January 1948).206-10.

The main requisites of a good broadcast are much the same as those of a lecture, writes a prominent British scientist. 'It should be constructed around a central theme, it should start with facts and ideas with which the listeners may be expected to be already familiar, it should go on to extend that knowledge, and it should give them a sense that they have mastered new ideas, and have been given a deeper insight.'

CARSON, SAUL, Radio: Freedom and License, *New Republic*, 119 (6 December 1948).34-6.

Carson reviews the published facts in the KMPC case, involving the alleged slanting of news to conform to the licensee's expressed wishes.

COOKMAN, A. V., A Dramatic Critic Listens, *The B.B.C. Quarterly*, 2 (January 1948).221-4.

'The theatre of the air has temporarily transformed itself into the shop window of the older theatre, and in the exercise of this function it is too strenuously successful to be able to put into its own business that extra half ounce of concentrated creative energy which might make so much difference. Its own business? Is that not to make new plays out of those impressions, effects, and suggestions which the microphone is peculiarly fitted to convey and thereby, possibly, enlarge our conception of the scope of drama?' A London theatre critic writes on B.B.C. drama programs.

GOULD, JACK, How Comic Is Radio Comedy? *New York Times Magazine*, (21 November 1948).22, 64ff.

Radio comedy 'finds itself on a collective spot and facing a crucial challenge: Can it overcome its repetition? Can it meet the incessant cries of its professional critics that it must develop "something new" and "something different" or, like vaudeville, slowly perish from familiarity?'

HALEY, SIR WILLIAM, The Place of Broadcasting, *The B.B.C. Quarterly*, 2 (January 1948).193-7.

On the twenty-fifth anniversary of British broadcasting the B.B.C. director-general takes stock and expresses the philosophy of the British radio system.

HOUSEMAN, JOHN, The Men from Mars, *Harper's*, 197 (December 1948).74-82.

A vivid account of the rehearsals and broadcast of Orson Welles' memorable War of the Worlds in October 1938.

HUTTON, GRAHAM, Economics, Experts, and the Microphone, *The B.B.C. Quarterly*, 2 (January 1948).198-205.

'Broadcasting as a specialist on your special subject cannot be too carefully, too painstakingly, too scrupulously prepared.' The preparation must include 'repeated and often wearying rehearsals.' Hutton, an economist, discusses the communication problem of the expert and makes some helpful suggestions.

JACOB, MAJOR-GENERAL SIR IAN, The Voice of Britain in Europe, *The B.B.C. Quarterly*, 2 (January 1948).211-5.

The director of the B.B.C. Overseas Services describes Britain's approach to international broadcasting and the main methods used to convey British opinion to a foreign audience.

JAMES, E. P. H., Let's Stop Jumping to Conclusions about Television, *Printer's Ink*, 225 (15 October 1948).34-6, 57, 60.

The writer, a vice-president of Mutual, cautions against accepting as valid certain current assumptions, such as 'The television audience is strictly upper-bracket' or 'There's no great appeal in just looking at a guy talk.'

LANDRY, ROBERT, TV: Big Business, *The Nation*, 167 (25 December 1948).723-4.

'Television gives every evidence of being so costly that it must start life as big business.' Landry compares investment expenses of TV and radio and raises the probability that 'there will be only a handful of television broadcasters' as against radio's 3,000-odd licensees.

LAZARUS, FELIX, Inside Television—U.S.A., *Canadian Forum*, 28 (October 1948).155-6.

A lucid account of television in the United States.

MADDEN, CECIL, Television: Problems and Possibilities, *The B.B.C. Quarterly*, 2 (January 1948).225-8.

The B.B.C. Television Program Organizer discusses some of the specific problems involved in putting drama, comedy, and variety on television and points out possibilities for development of television as an art form.

McMANUS, MARTIN, J., JR., Federal Legislation Regulating Radio, *Southern California Law Review*, 20 (February 1947).146-71.

The author reviews the history of federal radio legislation and regulation and suggests that if Congress does enact a new radio law it should do something to raise the tone of broadcast programs and to limit advertising.

MENCKEN, H. L., Video Verbiage, *The New Yorker*, 24 (11 December 1948).102-5.

Television 'is making a grand collar from both radio and the movies, and among the lovely terms heard in the open-hearth furnaces whence it issues are *fishbowl, blast, gabber, white meat, angle shot, close-up, frame, gobo*, and *montage*.'

NEAL, JOHN S., JR., Federal Communications Commission and Its Licensing Function in the Public Interest—Constitutional Guarantee of Free Speech, *Temple Law Quarterly*, 21 (October 1947).135-9.

A criticism of FCC action in the New York *Daily News* FM case (1947). Neal asserts: 1. that the majority decision of the Commission not to admit evidence of social bias by the applicant because, while relevant, it was not conclusive, was in error; and 2. that the Commission's implication that such evidence, if otherwise admissible, would be a valid basis for choosing among applicants, would likely be unconstitutional

NELSON, HAROLD E., The Effect of Variation of Rate on the Recall by Radio Listeners of 'Straight' Newscasts, *Speech Monographs*, 15 (1948).173-80.

This experiment on 250 student-subjects used recall-testing 'to cast further light on various factors influencing oral presentation.' Five different newscasters each recorded five different newscasts at five different rates varying by increments of 25 words per minute from 125 words per minute to 225 words per minute. The most 'satisfactory' rate, as measured by student reaction, was 175 words per minute.

SEGAL, PAUL M., Recent Trends in Censorship of Radiobroadcast Programs, *Rocky Mt. Law Review*, 20 (June 1948).366-80.

The author traces 'oblique' means of governmental censorship and mentions the Blue Book, the Mayflower, WHKC, Scott, Rainey, and Port Huron cases. He concludes that 'the Commission is undergoing an expansion of its censorship of program material from the bases of good taste, public health, law compliance, and similar innocuous interventions, to a broader base of exercising upon its licensees a series of political, religious, and public views.'

SOLINGER, DAVID M., Unauthorized Uses of Television Broadcasts, *Columbia Law Review*, 48 (September 1948).848-75.

This is an analysis of established legal principles and their application to the many problems created by unauthorized uses of telecasts. 'Suppose, for example, that a local radio station places a television receiver in one of its broadcasting studios; and suppose, further, that it has one of its announcers transmit a blow-by-blow account of a prize fight based on what he sees on the television receiver—all in lieu of purchasing broadcasting rights to the fight.'

TOVELL, VINCENT, Letters in Canada: 1947: Drama, *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 17 (April 1948).278-85.

In the studios of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, some of the finest radio dramas heard on this continent are produced by Andrew Allan and a CBC repertory company. This article reviews a representative selection of the best dramatic writing in the Stage 47 and Stage 48 series. A list of plays broadcast during 1947 on these series is included.

UTLEY, CLIFTON M., How Illiterate Can Television Make Us? *Commonweal*, 49 (19 November 1948).137-9.

'Television is unquestionably a much more arresting medium than radio, and at the same time it's a medium that monopolizes entire attention when it is on, and prevents one from doing anything else constructive.'

WINTER, GORDON, Broadcasting to the Foreigner, *The Fortnightly*, No. 983 (November 1948).295-301.

'The problem of foreign-policy broadcasting eventually divides into questions of the merit and interest of the programmes, the power, frequencies, and times of day that are used and the knowledge, in the target countries, that the programme itself exists.'

WOLFE, CHARLES H., How to Pre-Test Your Radio Program, *Printer's Ink*, 224 (3 September 1948).32-3, 76ff.

'Pre-testing an accurate sample of the eventual audience tells the advertiser how effective

his show's entertainment and commercials are likely to be and what elements in his program might be improved before it is broadcast.' Wolfe outlines seven specific ways to use pre-testing and how to use pre-testing on specific types of programs.

DRAMA AND INTERPRETATION

BELL, CLIVE, The Critic's Role, *Nation*, 167 (20 November 1948).578-80.

'Good criticism not only puts people in the way of appreciating particular works; it makes them feel, it makes them remember, what intense and surprising pleasures are peculiar to the life of the spirit.'

FAUCONNIER, R. L., Tragedy and the Modern Theatre, *Queen's Quarterly*, 50 (Autumn 1948).327-32.

Fauconnier begins with what he considers 'the most plausible version' of Aristotle's theory of 'catharsis.' Tragedy in the modern theatre is basically the same, but important developments have arisen through the years to alter it. Man as an actor and as a spectator has become an individualist. Fauconnier discusses how that change was brought about, and its effect on tragedy in the modern theatre.

FREUD, RALPH, Central Staging Is Really Old Stuff, *Players*, 25 (December 1948).52-3, 72.

Freud and Margo Jones discuss a type of theatre production now receiving wide attention in America. Thousands of directors are wanting to know how to use this innovation successfully. This article, and succeeding ones, give methods and techniques of directing, acting, lighting, and staging *pent house, central staging, arena, circle, theatre-in-the-round* style.

GILLIS, HUGH W., A-B-C Training in Acting, *Players*, 25 (November 1948).28-9.

Gillis lists the phases of an actor's training covering several years and suggests the advisable order of their study for his best development.

JOHNSTON, ALVA, Aider and Abettor—II, *New Yorker*, 24 (30 October 1948).28-39.

This is a biographical sketch of stage designer, Jo Mielziner. It includes incidents which highlight his career of some twenty years in stage design.

MACMILLAN, DOUGALD, David Garrick, Manager: Notes on the Theatre as a Cultural Institution in England in the Eighteenth Century, *Studies in Philology*, 45 (October 1948).630-46.

MacMillan supplements accounts of David Garrick's career with a discussion of his personal qualifications and relationships with people during his career as 'production manager' of the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane. 'The Theatre Royal in the eighteenth century was a privileged institution under governmental protection and control,' aided and abetted by Garrick's good sense for business management.

NATHAN, GEORGE JEAN, Characters without Character, *American Mercury*, 67 (November 1948). 543-7.

Nathan berates the younger playwrights for faulty character drawing. He illustrates their weaknesses with examples from 'A Streetcar Named Desire,' 'All My Sons,' and from three short plays by Richard Harrity. Nathan considers five 'feints' by which authors distract their audiences from recognizing faulty characterizations.

PETIT, MAGDELENA, The Little Theatre in Chile, *Bulletin of the Pan American Union*, 82 (October 1948).560-5.

Petit discusses the efforts and achievements of the Experimental Theatre of the University of Chile. She includes the objectives, a list of the plays presented, illustrations of selected settings, and a sketch of the successful growth of the little theatre movement in popularity and scope.

RIESE, LAURE, Lifting New Curtains, *Canadian Forum*, 28 (December 1948).208-9.

This is an enthusiastic description of the revival of theatrical activity in France today. The French stage of today has an aspect of eternal youth mixed with deep feeling for past experiences.' Riese includes synopses and descriptive notes on the most important playwrights and their respective current plays.

ROBINSON, HORACE W., Recent Developments in Theatre Architecture, *Dramatics*, 20 (December 1948).4-6.

Robinson surveys recent developments and concludes that the new theatres, built and planned, contribute to the cultural and social life of the community and campus. They are serving the multiple purposes of museum, gallery, concert hall, lecture room, classroom, and rehearsal area. 'Theatre is no longer a cavernous place that lights to laughter and tears for three short hours.'

SAUVAGE, LEO, 'Red Gloves' and 'Dirty Hands.' *Nation*, 168 (1 January 1949).19-20.

This article discusses the translation and adaptation of Jean-Paul Sartre's 'Les Mains Sales' for the American stage. This play, called 'Red Gloves' in the United States, has again raised the problem of translation in stage drama as a result of the questionable methods of Daniel Taradash.

SHANE, TED, Broadway's Country Store, *Collier's*, 122 (13 November 1948).36-8.

Since 1842 costumes and fabrics by Dazian have dressed the theatrical world. Shane describes the 'dingy country store' from which all this glamor comes, and adds some historical background covering the period from its beginning to the present.

SMITH, JOHN HARRINGTON, French Sources for Six English Comedies, 1660-1750, *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 47 (October 1948).390-4.

This article includes references to six English plays, their French sources, a synopsis of each, and a brief discussion of each. Smith points out the differences between French and English taste in contemporary comedy of this period.

WYATT, EUPHEMIA VAN RENSSELAER, Youth Pulling the Curtain, *Catholic World*, 168 (October 1948).76-7.

Wyatt describes the efforts of a new theatre group, 'On Stage,' organized in New York City in 1947. The group has produced a large number of plays, and although it is without a theatre or a backer at present, the group continues with optimism and perseverance.

ZOLOTOW, MAURICE, Designing Woman, *Saturday Evening Post*, 221 (18 September 1948).32-3, 137-8, 142-4.

Zolotow's article features Lucinda Ballard, currently the prize-winning costume designer on Broadway. Says Ballard: 'For stage everything should be made to order. You can't take clothes out of everyday life and put them on a stage, and expect the clothes to look like they do in real life. Realism on the stage is never realism. The stage changes everything.

LANGUAGE AND PHONETICS

ANDERSON, DONALD G., Vocabulary and Group Status in the Sixth and Ninth Grades, *Elementary English*, 25 (December 1948).506-13.

This study set out to discover whether the possession of a large general vocabulary or certain specialized vocabularies in such areas as sports, radio, and movies aided in attaining higher social status in a classroom. The data indicated that possessors of good special vocabularies did have a greater chance of popularity among their classmates. However, only among the girls in the sixth and ninth grades (to whom the tests were administered) was the possession of a good vocabulary related to popularity.

BROWN, JAMES I., A Comparison of Listening and Reading Ability, *College English*, 10 (November 1948).105-7.

There is a definite, though low, positive correlation between reading and listening ability. With students of a certain ability level and materials of a certain difficulty level, reading is slightly more efficient than listening in terms of immediate recall.

BYKHOVSKY, B., The Morass of Modern Bourgeois Philosophy, *Etc.*, 6 (Autumn 1948).1-15.

The editors of *Etc.* have published this virulent attack on semantics despite their profound conviction that the author's ideas are erroneous. Bykhovsky, a Soviet philosopher, violently attacks the philosophy and literature of semantics. He concludes: 'the semanticists are the most vicious enemies of progressive ideas.'

COWAN, J. MILTON and BERNARD BLACK, An Experimental Study of Pause in English Grammar, *American Speech*, 23 (April 1948).89-99.

The investigators asked ten subjects to mark the pauses they perceived in speeches recorded by actors. Various grammatical constructions were found to be normally characterized by a pause (sentence-end, apposition, coordination); others were normally concatenated without a pause; still others seemed to follow no definite pattern.

FOSDICK, RAYMOND B., We Need New Words and New Faith, *New York Times Magazine*, (19 December 1948).7 ff.

Our greatly enlarged vocabulary representing technological advances is not matched by a comparable increase in vocabulary relating to ideas of social control.

HANFORD, JAMES H., Harvard Philology Forty Years Ago, *The Antioch Review*, 8 (Fall 1948).308-20.

The Harvard graduate program in English forty years ago brought together giants in the field of philological scholarship. It was, how-

ever, hardly possible to specialize in pure linguistics. Semantics in the modern sense was unheard of, and it was the wise (and rare) student who elected to work with Grandgent in elementary phonetics.

HARRIS, JESSE W., German Language Influences in St. Clair County, Illinois, *American Speech*, 23 (April 1948).106-10.

This study indicates the degree of influence the German settlers of the nineteenth century have had on the dwellers of St. Clair County. Present trends indicate that another twenty-five years will see German displaced as a language of everyday use, but its influence will be noticeable for a long time to come.

LEE, IRVING J., Freedom from Speech, *Etc.*, 6 (Autumn 1948).16-20.

This article raises questions concerning the supremacy of sincerity and/or intransigence as primary criteria of public utterance in debate. The principle of 'reliability' (ability to live, grow and develop) is offered as a philosophic way of life and as a democratic technique in persuasive speech.

PADOVER, SAUL K., Russia's War of Words, *Nation*, 168 (1 January 1949).13-5.

The United States needs a school to train qualified persons in political-psychological warfare. This corps of skilled personnel would fight the Russian *agitprop* which employs some 1,400,000 full-time paid propagandists in the 'war of words.'

READ, ALLEN WALKER, An Account of the Word 'Semantics,' *Word* 4 (August 1948).78-97.

This scholarly survey offers documentary proof for 1. thhe first appearance of *semantick* in English, 2. the establishment of *semantics* in logical positivism, 3. the use of *semantics* by Korzybski and his followers, and 4. popular developments in the use of *semantics*. The chief conclusion indicates that the variety of contexts of the word *semantics* is very diverse and no one can be dogmatic in maintaining that any particular use is the 'right' or 'correct' way.

SUNDWALL, JOHANNES, An Attempt at Assigning Phonetic Values to Certain Signs of Minoan, Linear Class B, *American Journal of Archeology*, 52 (April-June, 1948).311-20.

The author describes the archeologists' methods of determining the phonetic equivalent of certain signs on the Cretan tablets. He agrees that certain of the signs had syllabic values, while others were to be read as entire words. Upon analogical evidence, he hypothesizes open-syllable values for the particular signs studied.

THE TEACHING OF SPEECH

BLACKER, WILLIAM, Leading a Business Conference, *The National Business Education Quarterly*, 16 (Summer 1948).34-8.

A plea for well-planned, well-led conferences as indispensable training for administrators.

DRAKE, O. J., A Method for Teaching Speech to Engineering Students, *Journal of Engineering Education*, 39 (November 1948).184-9.

An outline of a speech course designed especially for students in the College of Engineering at New York University. Instead of placing the emphasis upon an analysis of tools involved in speech (phonetics, vocal elements of pitch, loudness, bodily action, etc.), emphasis is placed upon audience analysis and speech content in relation to the audience.

FENETY, VIRGINIA, An Effective Homeroom Period, *Journal of the National Association of Deans of Women*, 12 (October 1948).18-21.

A group of tenth graders learn some important aspects of cooperative living through active participation in discussion of current topics during the oft-wasted homeroom period.

GASKILL, GORDON, Town Meetings on the Rhine, *American Magazine*, 146 (November 1948).30-1, 136-9.

In an article filled with interesting examples, the author discusses the birth of the town meeting idea in the United States zone of Germany. 'Every night somewhere in the U. S. zone of Germany, another town meeting is eating away steadily at the herdlike German tradition which has for centuries taught them to cringe before any Hügel, however arrogant, and to follow any Hitler, however mad. If we succeed, this will be the greatest, most lasting victory of our occupation.'

HAAS, ROBERT, Playing Out Problems in Socio-Drama, *Recreation*, 42 (November 1948).367-8.

'Socio-drama is a discussion method. The basis of the discussion is an extemporaneous dramatization of some problem or real-life situation, by members of the discussion group.'

JENKINS, DAVID, Research in Group Dynamics, *Social Education*, 12 (December 1948).347-50.

A review of some of the research in group dynamics, including discussion groups.

MYERS, SPENCER, Making the Discussion Group an Effective Democratic Instrument, *The American School Board Journal* 117 (September 1948).37-40; 117 (October 1948).30-3.

The author defines and classifies discussion groups according to the purposes for which they are organized and on the basis of expected outcomes. His groups are: 1. growth-maturity, 2. experience-exchange, 3. springboard, 4. problem-exploration, 5. problem-decision-action, and 6. directed- learning.

PHILLIPS, J. DONALD, Report on Discussion 66, *Adult Education Journal*, 7(October 1948). 181-2.

The originator of '66' describes the procedure for this discussion technique. A large group is divided into committees of no more than six people, each committee discussing the question as a problem for approximately six minutes. He cites examples of its successful use.

SPEECH SCIENCE

BEKESEY, GEORG V., and WALTER A. ROSENBLITH, The Early History of Hearing—Observations and Theories, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 20 (November 1948)727-48.

The authors describe various stages in the development of the physics of hearing in their historical settings. They distinguish, in terms of instrumentation, five rather definite periods in the history of auditory physiology. These begin with the period of pure speculation, and conclude with the latest period, 'characterized by the use of the dental burr, experiments with living animals, and recordings of electrical effects.'

CLARK, K. C., H. W. RUDMOSE, J. C. EISENSTEIN, F. D. CARLSON, and R. A. WALKER, The Effects of High Altitude on Speech, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 20 (November 1948).776-86.

The authors measured speech spectra as a function of altitude. Using vowels, sibilants, words, and connected speech as test material, and working in pressure-simulated altitudes up to 40,000 feet, it was found 'that vowels and semi-vowels exhibit a loss in mean square pressure with altitude roughly proportional to the logarithm of the density ratio, while some consonants are little affected by altitude.'

GLASER, JOHN L., and KERON C. MORRICAL, A Comparison of Artificial Ear Couplers, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 20 (November 1948).771-5.

'Comparison is made of the response of several earphones measured on two different types of earphone couplers. Points of difference are noted and explained. In addition, the existence of certain characteristics which might influence the design and use of such couplers is brought out and proposed for further investigation.'

GOLDMAN, STANFORD, WESTON E. VIVIAN, CHI KUANG CHIEN, and HENRY N. BOWES, Electronic Mapping of the Activity of the Heart and Brain, *Science*, 108 (24 December 1948).720-3.

This reports a new way of collecting and presenting information concerning the activity of the heart and brain that assists the observer in 'distinguishing easily those items which are most significant in the melee of confusing data obtained by conventional electrocardiographic and electroencephalographic means.

GOODWIN, C. W., and S. N. STEIN, A Brain-Wave 'Correlator,' *Science*, 108 (5 November 1948). 507.

An instrument for analyzing the electrical activity of the brain is described. The technique 'consists of two square-wave generators, actuated by the outputs of two channels of an electroencephalograph.' By the addition of these square waves, a composite square-wave is produced, whose voltage, as 'read on a suitably lagged and calibrated a-c voltmeter, indicates the fraction of the total time during which the two inputs are of the same sign.'

KERSTA, L. G., Amplitude Cross-Section Representation with the Sound Spectrograph, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 20 (November 1948).796-801.

The device reported provides auxiliary presentation of spectrograms, produced by the 'sound spectrograph,' and portrays a two-dimensional spectrogram with axes of amplitude and frequency over a 35-db. range with the scale in uniform logarithmic steps.

KNUDSEN, VERN O., Sound Waves and Rhythms, *The Scientific Monthly*, 67 (December 1948). 430-5.

Dr. Knudsen's article is from an address presented in the symposium on Waves and Rhythms at the 1948 AAAS Centennial. After concise summarization of the history of acoustics, the

author reviews 'briefly, and in nontechnical manner, some of the progesss that has been made in recent years by certain investigations of (a) the propagation of sound waves through the atmosphere, and (b) the behavior of sound waves in rooms.' Means of improving speech reception in rooms, are suggested.

KOENIG, W., and A. E. RUPPEL, Quantitative Amplitude Representation in Sound Spectrograms, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 20 (November 1948).787-95.

'The sound spectrograph shows variations in signal intensity by varying shades of gray to black which, because of the nature of the recording medium, are not susceptible to quantitative interpretation.' The methods include contours, dot spacing, distinctive shadings, and variable area patterns.

MILLER, GEORGE A., and W. R. GARNER, The Masking of Tones by Repeated Bursts of Noise, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 20 (September 1948).691-6.

'The masking of tones by continuous and interrupted noise was determined for three noise intensities, three noise-time fractions, and rates of interruption varying from 0.5 to 512 interruptions per second. The decrease in masking effectiveness as a result of the discontinuity of the masking noise depends principally upon the duration of the silent interruption, and secondarily upon the frequency of the masked tone and the intensity of the noise.'

PUMPHREY, R. J., and T. GOLD, Phase Memory of the Ear: a Proof of the Reasonance Hypothesis, *Nature* (London), 161 (24 April 1948). 640.

Stating that no experiment has hitherto been recorded which is decisive for or against the reasonance hyphothesis, the authors report an experiment 'that constitutes a valid proof that the reasonance hyphothesis is true, and that the reasonators of the ear (at all but the lowest audible frequencies) are only lightly damped.'

DE VRIES, H. L., The Minimum Audible Energy, *Acta Oto-Laryngologica*, 36 (1/5—1/9, 1948, Fasc.3-4).230.5.

De Vries reports his determination of the influence of duration of signal on minimum audible intensity. 'For short signals (0.2 sec. or less) the intensity proves to be inversely proportional to the length of the signal.' The energy is constant, and is 0.4 times the minimum audible intensity (erg/sec) of longer signals.

WHAT CONSTITUTES HIGH FIDELITY REPRODUCTION? *Audio Engineering*, 32 December 1948).8,36-7.

Individual reviews of papers presented at the Acoustical Society Meeting in Cleveland, 6 November 1948. Includes: Snow, W.B., The Acoustic Facsimile as a Goal; Loye, D.P., Subjective Considerations for High Fidelity Reproduction; Olson, Harry F., The Reproductin of Sound; Maxfield, J.P., High Fidelity vs. Subjective 'Faithful' Sound Reproduction; and Begun, S.J., The Limitation Imposed by Sound Recording on High Fidelity Sound Reproduction.

PSYCHOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY OF SPEECH

AVERY, CHARLOTTE, Social Competence of Pre-School Acoustically Handicapped Children, *Journal of Exceptional Children*, 15 (December 1948).71-3,88.

Although fifty aurally handicapped children (10 months to 6 years old) did not develop intelligible speech at the normal age, they did not show retardation in social maturity as measured by the Vineland Social Maturity Scale.

BENDER, LAURETTA, and ARCHIE SILVER, Body Image Problems of the Brain Damaged Child, *Journal of Social Issues*, 4 (Fall 1948).84-9.

'The body image of the brain damaged child is disturbed by tonus pulls, equilibrium problems, perceptual and integrative difficulties and social inadequacy. . . . It is by recognizing the disability, understanding his body image needs and satisfying them, that the prognosis of the brain damaged child is improved.'

BROWN, R. E. C., Experimental Studies on the Reliability of Audiometry, *Journal of Laryngology and Otology*, 62 (August 1948).487-524.

Four separate experiments composed this report in which the factors checked for causing variations in two consecutive audiograms were differences in: 1. location, 2. operators, 3. calibration of audiometers, and 4. the effect of practice.

BROWN, SPENCER F., General Semantics and Physical Disability, *Journal of Social Issues*, 4 (Fall 1948).95-100.

The author presents some of the applications

which are being made of general semantics in the treatment of psychologic and social maladjustment associated with physical disabilities.

COX, IAN, Deafness in Young Children, *American Annals of the Deaf*, 93 (September 1948).330-3.

The author describes the 'Peep Show' method of audiometric testing of children—which was developed by Drs. C. S. Hallpike and M. R. Dix. The procedure consists of conditioning the child to push a button (this lights an entertaining picture) when stimulated by a light and a sound. Then the light stimulus is withdrawn, and the child responds to the sound by pushing a button.

DI CARLO, LOUIS M., An Educational Program for Children with Impaired Hearing, *The Elementary School Journal*, 49 (November 1948).160-7.

There is need for re-organization of education for the deaf on the basis of individual needs. There must be an early and thorough testing program in schools to detect the hard of hearing. The total health of the child must be considered. In the educational program, speech and voice training should have a position of major importance.

FITCH, WARING J., and LEROY I. HEDGECOCK, Which Hearing Aid Shall I Buy? *Hygeia* 26 (November 1948).812-4, 818, 820-1.

The purpose of the article is to provide a guide for the purchase of a hearing aid. The article also tells how speech disorders are related to hearing and can be overcome with a hearing aid.

KNAPP, PETER HOBART, Emotional Aspects of Hearing Loss, *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 10 (July-August 1948).203-22.

The interplay between mechanical and emotional factors makes many of the problems of hearing loss eminently psychosomatic.

LIMALI, TOM M., D.D.S., Cleft Palate Prosthesis, *Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine and Oral Pathology*, 1 (November 1948).1056-73.

The article shows what the dentist can contribute by prosthesis to the correction of defects of the face and oral cavity caused by congenital cleft palate.

MCANDREW, HELEN, Rigidity in the Deaf and the Blind, *Journal of Social Issues*, 4 (Fall 1948).72-7.

The results of an experimental study of blind, deaf, and normal children with comparable age and intelligence shows that the deaf and blind because of the barrier qualities of their handicaps tend to develop less differentiated and more rigid personalities.

NELSON, WILMA I., Audio-Visual Education for the Deaf, *Educational Screen*, 27 (November 1948).442-3.

Audio-visual materials are considered essential to learning at the Mary E. Bennett School for the deaf and hard of hearing in Los Angeles.

PHELPS, WINTHROP M., M.D., and T. ARTHUR TURNER, Left Hand, Right Hand, *Hygeia*, 26 (November 1948).808-9, 822.

The author discusses the importance of establishing handedness in the speech therapy program with cerebral palsied.

RAKOW, BERNARD A., PAUL G. EBNER, and SEVERN R. OMBRES, Successful Obturator for Four-Day-Old Infant with Cleft Palate, *Dental World*, 3 (1948).221-2.

The article relates the authors' successful construction and application of an obturator on a four-day-old child in order to overcome nursing difficulties arising from a cleft palate.

SALTZMAN, MAURICE, M.D., and MATTHEW S. ERSNER, M.D., Masking as an Aid in Audiometry in Children, *The Laryngoscope*, 58 (October 1948).1227-31.

The introduction of a masking tone can be an aid in obtaining a true audiogram.

SMITH, MAX, Teaching the Aphasic to Write, *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 4 (October 1948). 100-4.

The writer describes a technique which he found to be successful in overcoming agraphia. The technique involved the use of the 'image cards' to develop a specific association for each letter of the alphabet.

SWEET, CHARLES A., Thumb and Finger Sucking by Children, *American Journal of Orthodontics*, 34 (December 1948).1017-8.

Defects of the teeth and oral cavity are among the effects of thumb and finger sucking in children. If the habit is allowed to persist past the first year it may run on even into adult life. Enforced restraints and commands should be used by parents but censoring, nagging, and

shaming should be avoided. In cases of tongue and lip sucking, the dentist should be consulted for mechanical restraints.

TRACHT, VERNON S., Preliminary Findings on Testing the Cerebral Palsied with Raven's 'Progressive Matrices,' *Journal of Exceptional Children*, 15 (November 1948).77-9.

The purpose of this article is to bring to the attention of workers in the field of cerebral palsy a new type of general intelligence test which the writer found useful.

WARDALE, ALAN, M.D., Dental Conditions and Deafness, *Dental World*, 3 (Third Quarter 1948).147.

The article propounds the theory that deafness may be caused by gross dental disease.

WEBSTER, RICHARD C., M.D., Cleft Palate, Part II-Treatment, *Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine and Oral Pathology*, 1 (October 1948).943-80.

The author presents a detailed review of the literature concerning the treatment of cleft palate including such factors as the public health, pediatric, and surgical aspects of surgery.

NEWS AND NOTES

ROBERT F. RAY, *Editor*

PLANS AND PROGRESS

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO: During the summer of 1949 the University will conduct a high school speech institute under the direction of Thorrel B. Fest, with sections in both dramatic and forensic activities.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA: An important extension of the cooperative arrangements of the Speech Clinic has been put into effect through a new relationship set up by the Speech Clinic, the Department of Pediatrics of the University Hospitals, the Hospital School for Severely Handicapped Children, and the State Services for Crippled Children. A weekly diagnostic speech clinic is held in Children's Hospital and is in charge of Spencer F. Brown. Dr. Brown's staff includes an otolaryngologist, a pediatrician, and a clinical psychologist. Staff meetings are attended by speech pathology majors, clinical psychologists, pediatric residents, and the Speech Clinic staff.

During the eight weeks' summer session the new arrangement will provide case material for courses in speech problems of the cerebral palsied and for advanced clinical practice in speech correction. A limited number of graduate students will be permitted to spend full time on the theory and practice of speech correction with cerebral palsied cases.

Another addition to the Iowa summer session program is a seminar in audiometry, conducted by Scott N. Reger, which offers to qualified students an intensive study of theoretical and practical problems in the field of audiometric testing.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY: Forensics have been revived after a ten year lapse, and this summer a workshop in speech education will be offered with Gifford Blyton as instructor. Visiting consultants will be: Lionel Crocker, chairman of the Department of Speech at Denison University, and Charles VanRiper, director of the Speech Clinic at Western Michigan College. The program will include debates and discussions with Kentucky colleges, and radio discussions and demonstrations before Kentucky high schools.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI: Miami, Florida, broadcasters dropped commercial rivalry for a half-hour January 29 at 7 P.M. to cooperate in bringing 'The Skeleton,' a documentary program, as a public service broadcast. Produced by the University's Radio and Speech Department, the presentation was part of the current drive to 'finish the job' on the department's first building, which was halted in the skeleton stage by the hurricane and business collapse of 1926. The script was written by Radio Department chairman Sydney W. Head and documented the early history of the school with newspaper excerpts and eye-witness accounts. Twelve stations carried the broadcast.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN: A student-written, student-acted television drama was presented by the Department of Speech over station WWJ-TV during the first semester, and a demonstration debate on the national high school question was televised over WXYZ-TV.

AT NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY: The School of Speech has planned an extensive program for the summer session. In addition to the customary courses there will be three distinctive offerings in the form of symposia: One on motivation being conducted in collaboration with the Department of Psychology, another in speech correction, and a third in hearing problems. Each of these symposia will bring a number of lecturers to the campus from other educational institutions, from business and industry, and from allied areas. Another feature of the summer session will be the summer radio institute conducted in collaboration with the National Broadcasting System. During the summer of 1949 the work of the institute will be broadened and expanded to include television.

The School of Speech has recently established three additional clinics in connection with its work in speech correction and audiology: a clinic in hearing problems conducted in conjunction with the Medical School, a clinic in cleft palate problems conducted in connection with the Dental School, and a clinic in cerebral palsey conducted in connection with the Cook County Hospital at Chicago.

AT OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY: The Ohio Association of College Teachers of Speech is conducting a systematic study of speech education,

from kindergarten through the graduate school, in the state. Several independent types and sources of data are included in the analysis. A full report of the study is to be completed by the summer of 1949. Franklin H. Knower of Ohio State University is in charge of the survey.

A gift of $7,000 by the Leo J. Marks Charitable Trust of Columbus to the Ohio State Development Fund has enabled the Speech and Hearing Clinic to purchase equipment needed for rehabilitation services: Some of this money was used to buy furniture for the children's clinic opened this past summer; the remainder was spent for the new veteran's clinic. The latter provides for intensive training for hard-of-hearing veterans. Each veteran is given a detailed hearing aid evaluation, auditory training, lip-reading instruction, speech conservation training, and advice concerning patterns of emotional readjustment.

The first of a series of training conferences for discussion leaders under the auspices of the Ohio State University Discussion Service was held in Columbus January 29.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH: A lecture-demonstration course on hearing and deafness is being presented by the Department of Audiology, the Pittsburgh Eye and Ear Hospital, and the Pittsburgh League for the Hard of Hearing in conjunction with the Departments of Speech and Psychology. The course is designed to acquaint parents of pre-school and school age, aurally handicapped children and others working with hard-of-hearing or deaf children and in allied fields with some of the problems of hearing loss and with some of the modern methods of aural rehabilitation. The lectures, which have been endorsed by the Pittsburgh Otological Society are given weekly.

APPOINTMENTS

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA: Jay Murphy and Nancy Wood have joined the speech staff as instructors. George Middleton, who received his Bachelor of Arts degree from Birmingham Southern, has joined the speech staff as a graduate assistant.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA: Ruth P. Kentzler of the Department of Speech at the University of Hawaii is teaching at Arizona University on an exchange basis, while Mrs. Aletha S. Mattingly is teaching at the University of Hawaii. Dorothy E. Remley, associate professor of speech on leave from MacMurray College, Jacksonville, Illinois, is also engaged as an associate professor in the Department of Speech at the University of Hawaii.

AT FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY: William Newgord of the University of Minnesota and Anton Hagglund of the University of Wisconsin have been added to the staff of the Department of Speech.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN: Earl D. Schubert, formerly of the State University of Iowa, has joined the speech staff to carry on research and instruction in the visible speech project of the Bell Telephone Laboratories located on the Michigan campus. Visiting members of the Michigan faculty for the 1949 summer session will include Winton H. Beaven of Union College, Franklin H. Knower of Ohio State University, and Oren Parker and Harold Ross of Yale University.

ON THE STAGES

AT BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY: The Community Drama Service Play Festival is being held on the Bowling Green campus April 2. Since December each county in northwestern Ohio has held a one-act play festival, and the superior productions from each county have been presented.

AT LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY: The Louisiana Players Guild of LSU presented 'Merchant of Venice' in December, and 'Juno and the Paycock' in March.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN: Dramatic productions during the first semester included an original play by Robert Shedd, 'Summer Solstice'; a Children's Theatre production of 'The Emperor's New Clothes' by Charlotte Chorpenning; Marlowe's 'The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus'; and three bills of student-directed and produced one-act plays.

AT OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY: The major productions for 1948-9 include 'Everyman,' 'The Marriage of Figaro,' 'The Sea Gull,' and 'Candida.' The department in cooperation with the Department of English has also sponsored Margaret Webster's production of 'Hamlet,' a lecture by John C. Adams on the Shakespearian stage, and a lecture by Louis B. Wright, director of the Folger Library. In addition, three plays—'The Hasty Heart,' 'Heartbreak House,' and 'All My Sons'—have been presented by candidates for the Master's degree. In March student players presented 'The Princess and the Swine-

herd' for the Children's Theatre. During the year the theatre has been reconditioned with new floors, new seats, and new equipment.

AT THE MEETINGS

THE FLORIDA SPEECH ASSOCIATION: The following officers were elected for the coming year: president, C. Raymond Van Dusen; first vice-president, Thelma Jones; second vice-president, Eunice Horne; secretary-treasurer, Margaret McClellan; and editor of the *Bulletin*, Sydney Head.

AT LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY: The guest speaker for the Fifteenth Annual Conference on Speech Education to be held at Louisiana State June 13-23 will be Gordon Peterson of the Bell Telephone Laboratories. His subject will be Research in Visible Speech. Dr. Peterson, who completed his doctorate at LSU, taught at Ball State Teachers College and Northwestern University, and held a fellowship in wartime research at Harvard University.

MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH: The mid-year meeting was held in January at Michigan State College in the form of a 'Working Conference.' After an opening speech by Don Wheller, principal of Eastern High School, Lansing, on An Administrator Looks at Speech, the members attended sectional meetings to hear and discuss reports of three 'Action Committees' formed last year. Plans were made for a speech bulletin, to be issued three times a year. The staff will include: Paul W. Briggs, principal of Central High School in Bay City as editor, and Mary V. Griffiths, of the Speech Department in the same school, as assistant editor. The next meeting of the MATS will be held at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, April 22, in conjunction with the Michigan Schoolmasters Club. Plans have been completed to secure Henry L. Ewbank of the University of Wisconsin as the main speaker. The 32nd Annual State Championship Debate will be held in the evening. President of MATS is Albert B. Becker, Western Michigan College of Education.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN: Highlights of the annual Speech Conference and Reunion July 22 and 23 will be an address by James H. McBurney, Dean of the School of Speech, Northwestern University, and President of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION.

AT OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY: The Third Annual Conference on Public Affairs sponsored by Ohio State University was held at the Deshler-Wallick Hotel on March 3, 4, and 5. Over 250 students from 50 colleges attended and discussed the major problems of our foreign policy in 1949. The conference included public hearings, a radio broadcast, committee meetings, legislative assemblies, and a luncheon at which Francis B. Sayre, United States delegate to the United Nations, was the principal speaker.

AT RUTGERS UNIVERSITY: The annual Speech Association of New Jersey Conference was held at the Hotel Dennis in Atlantic City in November. Robert Porterfield, founder, manager, and director of the Barter Theatre of Virginia was the featured speaker. New officers for the year are: president Richard C. Reager, chairman of the Department of Speech, Rutgers; and secretary, Ruth Thomas, Passaic School System.

AT TEACHERS COLLEGE OF CONNECTICUT: A speech conference to acquaint teachers, principals, and superintendents with the need for a more thorough speech program in the public schools of the state was held last month at Teachers College. Speakers included Letitia Raubicheck, director of the Department of Speech Improvement of the New York City schools, and Wilbert Pronovost, director of the Speech Clinic of Boston University School of Education. The conference was under the joint direction of Geraldine Garrison, consultant on Speech and Hearing of the State Board of Education, and Brobury Pearce Ellis of the English Department at Teachers College.

PERSONAL NOTES

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS: Jack Hasch has been granted a Master's degree in theatre and has been appointed an instructor at Dartmouth. Grant Fairbanks, professor of speech, was chosen at editor of the *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders* by the American Speech and Hearing Association at its Washington meeting. Mrs. Elaine Pagel Paden, until recently instructor in speech at the University of Illinois, was designated as assistant to the editor.

AT LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY: Mary Louise Gehring, who completed work on her Master's degree at LSU at the end of the first semester, is teaching at Alabama Polytechnic Institute at Auburn. During the summer she plans to teach at Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI: Wayne E. Brockriede of the speech staff plans to begin work toward the Doctor's degree at Indiana University during the summer. C. Raymond